

---

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature



**Project Resourcing & Schedule**

**Management System**

**Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature**

**June 1, 2011 – August 31, 2011**



**California Department of Transportation**

**Division of Project Management**

**Office of Statewide Project Management Improvement**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>IPO Report for August 2011 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CALTRANS - PRSM Project Oversight Review Checklist (August 2011) .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>IPO Report for July 2011 .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>CALTRANS - PRSM Project Oversight Review Checklist (July 2011) .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>IPO Report for June 2011 .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>CALTRANS - PRSM Project Oversight Review Checklist (June 2011) .....</b>	<b>56</b>

## IPO Report for August 2011

**Project Name:** Caltrans PRSM

**Assessment Date:** August 31, 2011

**Frequency:** Monthly

### Oversight Provider Information

**Oversight Leader:** Cindy Blehm

**Organization:** Technology Management Solutions, Inc.

**Phone Number:** 916-591-1746

**Email:** [cindyblehm@aol.com](mailto:cindyblehm@aol.com)

\*\* Please note the transition of IPOC vendor this reporting period. For this status report, we will retain the previous vendor's history of comments in order to help with the transition. Starting next reporting period, TMS will retain only our observations for the project.

### Project Information

**Project Number:** 2660-160

**Department:** Transportation (Caltrans)

**Criticality:** High

**Agency:** Business, Transportation & Housing

**Last Approved Document/Date:** SPR (12/08/09)

**Total One-time Cost:** \$26,078,375

**Start Date:** June 7, 2000

**End Date:** June 13, 2011

**Project Manager:** Kari Gutierrez

**Organization:** Caltrans

**Phone Number:** (916) 654-7255

**Email:** [kari\\_gutierrez@dot.ca.gov](mailto:kari_gutierrez@dot.ca.gov)

### Summary: Current Status

**Project Phase:** Adaptation

**Planned Start Date:** May 20, 2009

**Planned End Date:** November 23, 2010

**Actual Start Date:** July 1, 2009

**Forecasted End Date:** October 28, 2011

### Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last Finance approved document.

**Ahead-of-schedule:**

One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%).  
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

**Behind Schedule**

**On-schedule:**

All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.  
(Within 5%)

**Behind Schedule:**

One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

**Comments:**

**Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved Special Project Report (SPR) dated December 8, 2009. The SPR stated the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010 and the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. Throughout June and July, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the change request. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension and cost increase. The PRSM Change Control Board created Project Change Request (PCR) 14 to track the non-technical (cost and schedule) changes associated with the Implementation Vendor change request. PCR 14 was approved by the PRSM Change Control Board, pending finalization and approval of the draft PRSM project schedule, on August 24, 2010. On September 1, 2010, the Implementation Vendor approved the new baseline schedule.

On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope (please note there was no requested change to schedule or overall PRSM project cost). The change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. The activities the Implementation Vendor proposed to change and/or move to Pilot include Data Conversion, System End to End Testing, Implementation Team Training, Technical Training, and Report Development. In addition, the Implementation Vendor proposed to decrease the amount of their support during Roll Out since they will be providing more up front support during Pilot.

After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. Although the schedule has been updated to reflect the original contract provisions, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are still in negotiations regarding the re-scope proposal. There are several key project activities, such as planning for the PRSM training program, that are dependent upon the outcome of the re-scope proposal so it is important that the re-scope proposal negotiations are settled timely, and that the outcome is used to clarify the project plan and critical project activities. In addition, during the week of January 24th, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables that were previously in draft form. These deliverables include the Data Initialization Plan (DIP), Pilot Plan, and System Test Plan. For information on the status of these deliverables, please refer to the General Comments section at the end of this report.

As part of the approval of the August 2010 approved Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. During the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies (defects) identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. In order to address the delay in the Adaption phase, an Executive Task Force was formed and PCR 16 was opened on April 6, 2011 to develop and track the status of the plan to move forward with the project (known as the Go Forward Plan). As part of PCR 16, the project schedule was rebaselined and detailed various next steps including data conversions, report development, and training.

As of June 21, 2011 PCR 16 was approved and closed. As part of the rebaselined schedule (dated June 22, 2011) from PCR 16, the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. Adaptation Phase activities (i.e., testing and data conversion) are scheduled to be completed by October 24, 2011. In addition, the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. This represents a delay of approximately 1 year and three months for Adaptation and approximately 10 months for the PRSM Project. The OCIO has requested that Caltrans submit a Special Project Request (SPR) for the schedule delay. Caltrans is currently working on a new SPR for the schedule change, and once the SPR has been approved, the status of the schedule will be reflected as On-Schedule. Please refer to the table below.

We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur. Please refer to the PRSM Project Schedule issue in the Issue section below for information regarding further potential impacts to the schedule.

<b>Document</b>	<b>End of Adaptation Phase</b>	<b>End of Project</b>
<b>SPR (dated 12/08/09)</b>	<b>02/2010</b>	<b>06/13/2011</b>
<b>Executive Steering Committee Approved Schedule (dated 09/01/2010)</b>	<b>11/23/2010</b>	<b>02/14/2012</b>
<b>Current Schedule (dated 06/22/2011)</b>	<b>10/24/2011</b>	<b>12/21/2012 (Statewide Rollout Acceptance)</b>

#### **New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

The project has recently revised the schedule to more accurately reflect the work that needs to be done (especially in the areas of testing and data conversion). Invalid dependencies were resolved and a more granular breakdown of tasks was determined. TMS has reviewed this new schedule and found that it appears to contain tasks at the appropriate level of tracking (most tasks are one week or less in duration, allowing the project to mitigate any slip quickly). Most tasks scheduled to be complete by the end of the month were completed on time (according to the current project schedule). One initial observation is that the schedule does not appear to be leveled at a resource level (many individuals are over-allocated and many tasks are assigned to the collective resource groups of "CalTrans" and "SAIC". Upon initial review of project documentation, there appears to be more detailed task breakdown activities described in Change Requests that are not tracked at the same level in the project plan. During the month of September, TMS will perform a one-time assessment of the project schedule that will contain a more thorough assessment of the structure and content of the project schedule.

Revised dates based on the most current schedule are shown below:

<b>Document</b>	<b>End of Adaptation Phase</b>	<b>End of Project</b>
<b>SPR (dated 12/08/09)</b>	<b>02/2010</b>	<b>06/13/2011</b>
<b>Executive Steering Committee Approved Schedule (dated</b>	<b>11/23/2010</b>	<b>02/14/2012</b>

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

09/01/2010)		
Current Schedule (dated 06/22/2011)	10/28/2011	12/26/12 (Statewide Rollout Acceptance)

**Resources (Level of Effort)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Fewer Resources**

Completion of one or more major tasks and / or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

**Within Resources**

All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

**More Resources**

**More Resources**

Completion of major tasks and / or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

**Comments:** **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

In the February 2011 reporting period, a new Implementation Vendor Project Manager joined the PRSM Project Team. In the March 2011 reporting period, a few of the PRSM Project Team roles were updated. The previous IT Lead is now the Release Manager and Configuration Manager. A new team member was brought on to the project to fill in as the new IT Lead. In addition, during the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay in Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies (defects) identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. There are three current resource concerns associated with the Adaptation Phase: (1) The testing team has noted that some of the anomalies identified during testing represent questions regarding system functionality. During the beginning of testing, a business analyst was not on-hand to support the testing team. In addition, the system has not been documented from a user or tester perspective, which would assist in providing a guide to how the system should function. If an issue arose during testing, the testers were unsure if it was a defect or how the system should function. Although the Implementation Vendor has provided an Architect that is available to assist the testing team during half of their sessions and is also on-call to answer any questions that arise, additional business resources may be needed during testing. (2) Due to the number of anomalies found during configuration testing, additional time has been built into the schedule. Caltrans has added two (2) additional resources to assist with the testing effort (one to assist with Configuration Testing and the other to assist with Integration Testing). In order to mitigate future schedule delays, additional resources may be needed to resolve anomalies and assist in the testing effort; (3) the current status of the conversion effort as a whole has not been reported clearly during the PRSM Project Status Meetings. This is partially due to the fact that there is not a single point of contact / owner for the Data Conversion effort. In order for Data Conversion to be successful, an owner needs to be identified to manage the effort. In the March 2011 reporting period, an owner was identified to manage the Data Conversion effort and report on the status. In addition, the

PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of July. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. We will continue to closely monitor the resource status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur.

**New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

The project appears to have the appropriate staff in place in all the lead positions. There does appear to be a need for more testers on both the vendor side as well as within Caltrans and a new project risk was identified to track this risk and the corresponding mitigation steps. The project team is currently performing a detailed assessment of where the testing efforts are at, the current issues that need to be mitigated and the number of resources that they believe are needed to complete the testing effort.

**Resources (Budget/Cost)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Less cost**

The project is (>5%) under budget.

**Within cost**

The project is operating within budget.

**Within Cost**

**Higher cost**

Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

**Comments:** **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with a cost increase of \$947,422. Throughout June and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the potential cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved a cost increase of \$864,977 (\$464,977 from removing Years 2-3 Custom Code Maintenance and \$400,000 from "Unanticipated Cost"). The Implementation Vendor's change request is linked to the following PRSM PCR's: PCR 13 (Changes from FIDO to EFIS Interface – Technical Requirements) and PCR 14 (Changes from FIDO to EFIS Interface – Non-Technical Requirements), which have been approved by the PRSM Change Control Board.

**New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS has reviewed the vendor deliverable tracking spreadsheet and the updated cumulative expenditures that the project has reported in the most current CA-PMM report. However, we have not been able to obtain a cost tracking spreadsheet showing the expenditures per month that are anticipated for the remainder of the project. In order to properly assess the cost for PRSM, TMS will need to view the expended and projected monthly tracking expenditures and compare that to the economic analysis worksheet in the last approved SPR.

**Quality (Client Functionality)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Adequately Defined**

Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

**Inadequately Defined**

**Inadequately Defined**

One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

**Comments: Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

At this point in time, given the delays in testing, it is unclear if the required functionality has been successfully built into the system. There is a concern that test scripts may not adequately reflect requirements. During the January reporting period, we reported that out of 334 total requirements, 15 have been fully satisfied and 16 have been partially satisfied (303 have not been satisfied). In addition, out of a total of 99 test scripts, 19 have been executed and 20 have been informally executed (60 have not been executed). Please note that updated metrics have not been provided since February 2011. During the month of May, Caltrans analyzed developed test cases to determine if they would satisfy requirements. For requirements that were not addressed by the developed test cases, Caltrans plans to develop new test cases. Further, configuration testing will be restarted and all test cases will be executed prior to the end of the Adaptation phase. For more information, please refer to **Issue I-4: Configuration Testing**.

In addition, there have been a significant number of problems associated with data conversions. Per the PRSM Risks & Issues Status Meeting on 07/27/2011, data conversion testing activities are still in progress and issues have been identified (i.e., issue #255). Data Conversion activities are being performed for project data and historical data. During the weekly PRSM Project Status Meetings, the PRSM Project Team has noted that legacy data has presented some challenges and there have been some issues with loading the data. If the issues of data cleansing and data load are not mitigated or resolved prior to Pilot and roll out, there is a possibility that only a small sub-set of projects will load correctly. The PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of July. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. We will continue to monitor this area closely and report any updates as they occur. For more information, please refer to **Issue I-3: Data Conversions**.

**New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS has scanned through the requirements and to-be use cases and workflows created for PRSM and found them to be quite thorough and inclusive of the underlying solution flow. TMS has not yet located the data conversion requirement. TMS has also reviewed the traceability spreadsheets in the project document library and found that there are many to-be use cases that are not traced from any FEATs and many to-be use cases without associated test cases. This could be an indication of insufficient testing coverage. TMS will work with the project team over the next month to understand the potential gaps in more detail.

TMS was unable to find any test metrics in the document library. We will work with the project team during the next month to understand in more detail the current state of the testing efforts

**Quality (Architecture/System Performance)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Adequately Defined**

The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

**Adequately Defined**

**Inadequately Defined**

The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.



**Comments: Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. The Production environment hardware has been configured and turned over to Caltrans. The Implementation Vendor submitted an Application Installation-Platform Acceptance Report, which was approved after revisions were made. The PRSM Project Team has renewed Oracle licenses and they are currently in the process of planning Help Desk support activities, which will be used to provide support to the districts post implementation.

**New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS has not yet located the system technical architecture documentation. We will work with the project to obtain these documents and will follow up with a high level assessment of the quality of the architecture next month. TMS has observed a lack of performance, volume and scalability testing from a test plan, test case or test execution perspective. Again, we will work with the project over the next month to better understand the system quality of PRSM.

### New Issues

There are no new issues.

### Issues

#### Issue I-4: Configuration Testing

**Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

Issue Statement: There have been many unexpected problems with the Configuration Testing component of the project (see the Comments under the Quality section above). The number of defects/anomalies and slow progress of Configuration Testing is causing additional schedule delays as configuration testing is in the critical path for entering the Pilot phase of the project.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: David Cordone

**IPOC Recommendations:**

I-4a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team develop a remediation plan for testing the issues and recommendations identified in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis.

I-4b - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team apply additional resources if necessary to expedite the Configuration Testing. The PRSM project team should keep the Executive Steering Committee informed of the status of this issue and request additional resources if necessary.

**Status Update:**

July 11 Status: Configuration testing restarted the week of 07/08/2011 and is currently in progress. There are approximately 50 different configuration changes currently being tested and worked on. In addition, per the Caltrans Unit Testing Status (Week Ending 7/08/11), all of the EFIS Unit Test cases and Staff Central Unit Test cases have been tested and passed.

June 11 Status: Per the rebaselined schedule, configuration testing was supposed to start on 06/20/11. However, due to the organizational breakdown structure changes in PRSM, configuration testing did not resume until 07/8/2011.

### **New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS was unable to find any configuration test cases or testing results in iCenter. We will work with the project team over the next month to understand the current state of configuration testing.

## New Issue I-3: Data Conversions

### **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

Issue Statement: There have been many unexpected problems with the dry-run data conversion process. For several of the Districts' pilot data, there has not been a successful dry-run to date. This may cause additional schedule delays and impact the quality of integration testing.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Jacquelyn Moore

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

I-3a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team develop a remediation plan for the data conversion issues and recommendations identified in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis.

I-3b - IPOC recommends that additional resources (including a data conversion lead) to be applied as necessary to the data conversion effort in order to keep this component of the project on track. The PRSM project team should keep the Executive Steering Committee informed of the status of this issue and request additional resources if necessary.

### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of July. They are currently working towards testing and resolving any issues. As of the last PRSM status meeting (07/20/2011), data conversion efforts are still focused on the Data Initialization Plan. The data dictionary and conversion plan have been completed and Caltrans is still working on the implementation plan. Per the current workplan, the implementation plan should be finalized and received by Caltrans by 08/01/2011.

June 11 Status: The Data Task Force met during the month of June. As of the last PRSM status meeting (06/22/2011), data conversion efforts are focused on the Data Initialization Plan. The data dictionary and conversion plan have been completed and Caltrans is still working on the implementation/test plan. Further, in the prior month, a sizing/capacity estimate of the test environment was performed using expenditure data and projects from District 4.

### **New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS has reviewed the IV&V Root Cause Analysis report and has scanned through the Data Initialization Plan (which is actually three documents: PRSM Conversion Plan (approved), Data Dictionary (approved) and Implementation Plan (not yet written)). We are in the process of understanding the current status of the conversion activities. From what we have observed so far, it appears that many of the recommendations suggested in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis report have been implemented and that recent meetings have taken place to review the tasks outlined in the schedule for further decomposition, streamline activities and restructure task dependencies to more accurately reflect how the work will be performed. The project reported that a baseline conversion process is being developed to define the interactions between test cases. It appears that progress is being made for many districts. IPOC will be investigating the following areas over the next month to determine if there are any current issues related to conversion:

- Has volume testing been performed on conversion?
- Review of the current conversion metrics showing what has been successfully converted and what remains to be converted
- In-depth review of the most current Conversion Plan, the Baseline Conversion Process, workflow, processes, and test cases.
- Understanding of the current status of the Implementation Plan and expected availability date
- Reconciliation of discrete tasks listed in the go-forward plan with high level tasks in the project schedule

## Issue I-2: PRSM Project Schedule

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

### Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):

**Issue Statement:** As part of the approval of the Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. During the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. Although additional time has been built into the schedule, if activities at the task level are not appropriately managed, it could result in additional delays. In addition, there is a risk that the Implementation Vendor could submit another change request for increased costs. Please refer to the Schedule section on page 1 for additional information.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

I-2a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team continue to evaluate the remaining testing and data conversion activities and build additional time into the PRSM Project Schedule as needed. Delays at the task and activity level should be recorded and tracked. In addition, delays that affect the critical path should be immediately discussed with members of the PRSM Project Management Team. If necessary, daily checkpoint meetings should be conducted to resolve issues that impact the critical path. Issues that cannot be resolved at the PRSM project team level should be escalated to the Executive Steering Committee immediately.

I-2b -During the week of January 24<sup>th</sup>, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan (known as the go-forward plan) for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables by the end of February 2011. As of this IPOR, none of these deliverables have been finalized, however the project schedule has been partially updated to match the go-forward plan. IPOC recommends that Caltrans monitor the status of these deliverables and work with the Implementation Vendor to finalize them by the end of May 2011. Please refer to the General Comments section at the end of this IPOR for more information.

I-2c - IPOC recommends that the progress of testing and data conversion should be reported in writing during the Status Meetings.

### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: No new status.

June 11 Status: As of the last PRSM Project Status Meeting (dated 06/22/2011), the project schedule had been rebaselined to reflect the end of the Adaption phase milestone 10/24/2011.

### New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):

The project has made recent revisions to the project schedule that include a more granular breakdown of tasks, re-validation of task dependencies and adjustments to dates based on current progress in the conversion and configuration efforts. The project is working on a critical path report and IPOC will review once it is available. As of the 8/23/11 project schedule, the new date for the end of the Adaption Phase shows 10/28/11. Until the SPR is approved and reflects the current schedule, this issue will remain open.

During the next month, IPOC will work with the project to understand some observed discrepancies between the detailed granular tasks in the go-forward plan and the high-level tasks in the project workplan. Additionally, next month, IPOC will be performing a one-time detailed assessment report of the project schedule and will provide findings and recommendations regarding the structure, format, and content of the current workplan.

## Issue I-1: EFIS Interface (PCR 13)

### **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

**Issue Statement:** The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and CTIPS are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. While developing to one standard interface presents a business opportunity, specifications and data requirements will need to be analyzed and documented. The development of the EFIS interface is a critical step for the PRSM project to proceed to the Pilot phase. EFIS went live in July 2010. The development of the EFIS interface could impact the cost of PRSM. There are two (2) potential scenarios related to this issue that could impact the schedule and / or cost: 1) the time compression in the transition of EFIS support from the EFIS Implementation Vendor to Caltrans could result in the EFIS Implementation Vendor fully focused on knowledge transfer and transition. The limited availability of EFIS resources could result in a delay in the development of the EFIS interface; and 2) with the focus on knowledge transfer and transition, PRSM is a lower priority for EFIS related support, which could result in resource constraints when it comes time to supporting the PRSM/EFIS interface/testing efforts.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

I-2a PRSM interface acceptance criteria for entry to the Pilot phase should be agreed upon by the PRSM Project Team and Business Stakeholders. The criteria should include specifying the quality and completeness of the interfaces (degree of production readiness) before the Pilot phase.

I-2b - Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

### Status Update:

July 11 Status: As of the last Caltrans Unit Test Status (dated 07/08/2011), Caltrans has completed unit testing for both EFIS and Staff Central.

June 11 Status: No new status.

### New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):

According to the project schedule, EFIS development and unit testing is complete. Update to the EFIS test cases was suppose to complete by the end of August and EFIS testing is scheduled for the last half of September. It appears that the project is on-track with EFIS related activities; however, IPOC will continue to work with the project to understand the current status of the detailed tasks outlined in PCR 13 as well as any current issues or concerns with integrating EFIS into the project.

## New Risks

### Risk R-4: PRSM Pilot Phase Readiness

#### Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):

Risk Statement: With the Adaptation phase projected to finish in October 2011, the pilot start date of [10/24/11] has been solidified in the work plan. If certain risks are realized during the remainder of the Adaption phase, or if the pilot districts are not well prepared, then success of the Pilot phase may be impacted.

Probability: Medium      Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

#### IPOC Recommendations:

R-4a - Clearly identify, document, and get consensus on pilot entry and exit criteria in order to enable a smooth transition from Adaptation to Pilot.

R-4b - Closely monitor risks and issues leading to Pilot. Any risks realized or issues that cannot be resolved should be escalated to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution immediately.

R-4c - Ensure that communications with the pilot district leadership and stakeholders is fluid and frequent so that there are no surprises upon pilot entry and during the pilot phase.

#### New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):

The schedule is now showing the end of the adaptation phase to be 10/28 and pilot kickoff to be 10/28/11. TMS understands the general concern in the above risk statement, but believes that it is too general of a statement to prepare any mitigation or contingency plans against. The previous IPOC vendor refers to "certain risks" occurring during the remainder of the Adaption phase; however, those risks are not described and remain vague and undefined. TMS agrees with the general recommendations provided by the previous IPOC, however, in the upcoming IPORs TMS will close out this risk and if appropriate, open new risks that are more targeted to a specific area of concern for the project.

## Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

### Risk R-3: PRSM Project Costs

#### Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

**Risk Statement:** With the previous delays in the PRSM project schedule and the remaining Adaptation activities (i.e., data conversion and testing) there is a possibility of another schedule delay. The possibility of another delay in the PRSM project schedule could have an impact on the cost of the project.

Probability: Medium    Impact: High    Time Frame: Short Term    Severity: High    Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

R-3a – IPOC recommends that the current delay in Adaptation and the potential additional delays be discussed with the Executive Steering Committee. Upon review of the previous approved Implementation Vendor change request, if it is deemed likely that another change request for cost will be submitted, discussions with the Implementation Vendor should occur immediately.

R-3b - IPOC recommends that potential Caltrans resource needs / cost impacts are assessed given the delay in Adaptation. These resource and potential cost impacts should be discussed with the executive steering committee.

### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status:        As of the July 2011 reporting period, there has not been an increase in costs.

June 11 Status:        As of the June 2011 reporting period, there has not been an increase in costs.

### **New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS agrees that further delays in the project schedule could equate to higher costs, however, we feel this risk as defined is too general to take action upon. TMS is in the process of trying to understand the project costs spreadsheets provided to us and reconcile these with the economic analysis worksheets in the last approved SPR. Once we can understand the detailed project tracking as it relates to the approved SPR worksheets, we will open new risks, if appropriate with more specific areas of focus.

## Risk R-2: Resource Availability

### **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

**Risk Statement:** Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium    Impact: Medium    Time Frame: Short    Severity: Medium    Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

R-2a - After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.

R-2b - Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status:    No new status.

June 11 Status:    No new status. In the March 2011 reporting period, a few of the PRSM Project Team roles were updated. The previous IT Lead became the Release Manager and Configuration Manager. A new team member was brought on to the project to fill in as the new IT Lead. During the February 2011 reporting period, a new Implementation Vendor Project Manager joined the PRSM Project Team. The previous Implementation Vendor Project Manager will stay on board to assist in the transition process. During the January 2011 reporting period, the Implementation Vendor has provided an Architect that is available to assist the testing team during half of their sessions and is on-call to answer questions. In addition, Caltrans has added two (2) additional resources to assist with the testing effort (one to assist with Configuration Testing and the other to assist with Integration Testing). Please refer to the **Resource** section on page 2 for additional information. As of the month of May, the Release Manager and Configuration Manager has transitioned back to the IT Lead

### **New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

TMS is currently working to understand the State and vendor staffing on the project including percent allocation to the project. We have observed that additional staff on both sides will most likely be needed to complete the testing activities. Upon initial review of the project schedule, TMS is unable to determine how much staff will be needed to complete the remaining activities in the Adaption phase due to the fact that many activities are assigned to collective groups and due to the large degree of over-allocation in the schedule. We will work with the project team in September to understand the staffing needs for the project.

### **Risk R-1: Business Process Changes and Organizational Change Management**

#### **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

**Risk Statement:** One of the most significant challenges to the PRSM Project could be engaging and obtaining buy-in from District executives, management and staff. It is very important that District executives and management are knowledgeable about PRSM and the changes to their business processes and benefits of using PRSM. District staff, in addition to training, should be knowledgeable of the decisions and consequences of changing / standardizing business processes. Lack of engagement of District personnel at all levels could have a negative impact on overall PRSM system acceptance and usage.

Probability: High

Impact: High

Time Frame: Med

Severity: High

Assigned to: David Youmans

#### **IPOC Recommendations:**

R-1a - Define the process for gaining District consensus on policies, new business rules and business processes. The process should describe how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

R-1b - Modify the format of the monthly Implementation Manager's Video Conference Meeting to begin utilizing this forum as a mechanism for Organizational Change Management. As PRSM gets closer to District roll out, change the frequency of these meetings to bi-weekly.

R-1c - Assess the changes to the training program/plan proposed in the most recent implementation vendor change request in order to understand the impact on Organizational Change Management. Work with the Districts to help them understand the changes to the training program in order to gain organizational buy-in and confirm that the program is adequate to enable a successful Roll Out.

R-1d - Assess the impact of the Implementation Vendor Change Request on Organizational Change Management.

R-1e - Consider hiring / extending additional consulting resources to assist with refining the Organizational Change Management Plan and to execute the plan.

#### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: The PRSM Prep Course was delivered in July 2011 to the Implementation Managers.

June 11 Status: No new status. During the May reporting period, an outline of the PRSM Prep Course was presented during the Implementation Manager's meeting. On 5/26, a trial run of the course occurred with approximately 20 Caltrans Headquarters staff that were not involved with the PRSM project. Caltrans is currently aiming to deliver an expanded PRSM Prep Course during the month of July via video conference to Implementation Managers. During the April reporting period, IPOC met with the Organizational Change Management Team and discussed the plan for preparing for and implementing organizational change management at the districts. During this meeting, IPOC provided comments and recommendations to enhance the plan. In addition, IPOC was provided with the Draft Organizational Change Management Plan and provided comments.

#### **New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):**

IPOC will review the Pilot Readiness plan in September. To the best of our knowledge, the Implementation Plan has not been created. The Implementation Plan is now part of what used to be referred to as the Data Initialization Plan which has since been divided into three separate deliverables: the data dictionary (approved), Data Conversion Plan (approved) and the Implementation Plan (draft report has not yet been developed). As per the schedule dated 08/31, the Implementation Plan was due to be delivered to Caltrans on 08/25, yet the percent complete is only 20% and to the best of IPOC's knowledge, this plan was not submitted by SAIC. Updates were not provided at the core status meeting.

### **General Comments**

#### **Previous IPOC Vendor Comments (Deloitte):**

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy. IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month

of May, including PRSM Status meetings, PRSM Risk and Issues meetings and PRSM Project Managers meeting.

On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. Throughout June 2010 and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the change request. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension (approximately 5 months) and cost increase. On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope (please note there is no change to schedule or cost). This change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. The goal for this is to keep activities in Adaptation that can be completed prior to November 23<sup>rd</sup> and move the remaining activities into early Pilot. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. In addition, during the week of January 24th, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables that were previously in draft form. These deliverables include the Data Initialization Plan (DIP), Pilot Plan, and System Test Plan and were scheduled to be completed in February 2011. As of the June 22<sup>nd</sup> PRSM Project Status Meeting, only the System Test Plan was agreed upon and finalized. The DIP and the Pilot Plan were still in progress and have not been completed. As of July 2011, the Pilot Plan was being worked on by both the Implementation Vendor's and Caltrans' Implementation Managers. The Implementation managers are projected to be completed with their revisions to the Pilot Plan by the end of August 2011, with the finalized Pilot Plan being available by the end of September 2011. In addition, the Data Initialization Plan (DIP) has been divided into three (3) components: Data Dictionary, Conversion, and Implementation plan. The Data Dictionary and Conversion plans have been completed. The Implementation plan component of the DIP is in progress and is projected to be completed by early August 2011. For more information on the data conversion issues, please refer to Issue I-3: Data Conversions.

As part of the approval of the August 2010 approved Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011 and the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. Please refer to the Schedule Section on Page 1 for additional information.

In the July 2010 reporting period, the PRSM project was re-organized so that the Project Management function is now under IT and a new Project Manager has been assigned to PRSM. This new Project Manager will be responsible for the day to day, hands-on project management activities for PRSM. The Project Management function was previously under the Division of Project Management. With the re-organization, the previous Project Manager is now providing oversight as the Project Director.

A number of project processes have been modified since the change in Project Management structure in July 2010. The PRSM Project Schedule, which was previously managed by the Implementation Vendor, is now managed by Caltrans. The new Project Manager has added baseline start and finish columns to the schedule to track baseline completion dates against actual completion dates. During the bi-weekly PRSM Project Status Meetings, the new Project Manager has allocated time in the agenda for each of the PRSM Project Team Workgroups (such as Configuration, Interfaces, Conversion, etc.) to conduct brief status updates of their current tasks, risks, and issues. Beginning in May 2011, the structure of the PRSM Project Status meetings will change. Going forward, attendees of the status meetings will only include PRSM Project Managers and Oversight vendors. The purpose of these meetings will be to provide a status update of each area of the project, without going into the task level detail of the work plan. In addition to these meetings, another weekly meeting will be scheduled for each area (i.e., testing, training). During these meetings, team members will update the schedule based on their assigned activities and provide updates to their team lead.

In addition to the bi-weekly PRSM Status meetings and the bi-weekly PRSM Risk and Issues meetings, PRSM Change Management meetings occur on a weekly basis if there are open changes to discuss. During these meetings new and open project change requests (PCR's) are discussed by PRSM Project Management and the Implementation Vendor Project Manager. As of the 07/19/2011 PRSM Project PCR Log, there were no recently opened PCRs, three PCRs in progress (15: Update Training Plan; 20: Update to Configuration Management Plan, and 21: Updated To\_Be Business Processes from version 2.3 to 3.0), and no recently closed PCRs.

In August 2010, the Caltrans Enterprise Technology Investment Division requested that IPOC perform a health check assessment on the PRSM project. The objective of the health check assessment was to provide a point in time assessment of the PRSM project and identify findings, risks and recommendations associated with Project Management and Systems Development Lifecycle (SDLC) areas. IPOC activities performed for the Health Check assessment

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature





included interviewing key project team members and reviewing project documentation. On October 7, 2010, IPOC submitted the finalized Health Check report to Caltrans.

### New IPOC Observations (Technology Management Solutions):

From this point forward, TMS will be including the following project management process chart in each IPOR documenting TMS's assessment of each major area of project management on the PRSM project.








This General Comments section focuses on the project management processes. An overall assessment of each Project Management Process Area is given by a color code in the table below.

**RED** = Unsatisfactory project management practices that present significant risk to the project.  
**YELLOW** = Corrections to project management practices needed to reduce risks.  
**GREEN** = Satisfactory project management practices are being followed.  
**BLUE** = Assessment in progress.



Process Area	Rating	SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT	Recommendations for Improvement
<b>General Project Management</b>		TMS has reviewed at a high level the Communications Plan, Change Management Plan, System Test Plan, Configuration Plan and Project Work Plan. Next month we provide a one-time assessment of the overall project management plans which will also include assessment of the quality management plan, risk management plan, issue management plan, and document management plan.	
<b>Planning and Tracking (Work Plan)</b>		TMS has reviewed the current project workplan and will provide a one-time assessment of the format, structure and content of the schedule in September. Upon initial observation, the plan contains adequate predecessors and successors, resource names assigned to tasks for the current phase, percent complete updates, and most tasks are at a trackable level (less than 2 weeks in duration). However, the plan does not appear to be resource leveled (many individual resources are over-allocated and there are many tasks assigned to the collective resource group of CalTrans and SAIC. This item will be updated next month following our in-depth review of the schedule.	
<b>Quality Management</b>		IPOC has located a Quality Management Plan dated September 4, 2009, version A that we will be reviewing next month. TMS has not yet located any project management or technical quality metrics that are collected and analyzed on a regular basis.	
<b>Requirements Management</b>		TMS has located the PRSM requirements, features, use cases and traceability matrices. Initial observation show that a significant amount of work has gone into documenting the PRSM functional behavior and initial traceability has been done from use cases to test cases. TMS has observed that there are many use cases with no associated features and many use cases with no associated test cases. We will continue to investigate this area in	



Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Process Area	Rating	SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT	Recommendations for improvement
		the upcoming months.	
<b>Configuration Management</b>		TMS has reviewed the Configuration Plan at a high-level and found the plan to lack specific entry and exit criteria for each stage of promotion, specific roles and responsibilities for many of the detailed steps described in the plan, and a lack of project management process documentation as a configurable item.	
<b>Change Management</b>		TMS has reviewed version 2.1 dated 3/24/11 of the Change Management Plan at a high level. Detailed observations, findings and recommendations will be provided in September in the one-time assessment of project management plans.	
<b>Risk Management</b>		<p>The project holds biweekly risk and issues meetings. All risks are numbered and contain an owner, category for the risk, risk statement, risk probability, impact, exposure, risk level, phase of impact, risk response type, mitigation and/or contingency plan, triggers and status updates.</p> <p>TMS found a Risk Management Plan dated 12/21/07 v4.4 in the project document library. We will review this plan during the next month and provide feedback to the project.</p>	
<b>Issue Management</b>		The project has an Issue Management Plan that was provided to TMS but the file is corrupted. TMS has observed that the project practices Issue Management and hold bi-weekly meetings to discuss the current project issues at hand. Upon initial observation the project seems to understand the difference between a risk and an issue and appears to move items between the two categories when it is appropriate to do so.	
<b>Communication Management</b>		TMS has reviewed a draft version of the Communication Plan dated May 6, 2009 at a high level. Detailed observations, findings and recommendations will be provided in September in the one-time assessment of project management plans.	
<b>Business Readiness</b>		The Pilot Readiness plan will be reviewed next month by TMS.	
<b>Testing</b>		TMS has reviewed the Adaptation System Test Plan at a high-level and it appears to contain all the necessary components to implement a quality-driven	

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Process Area	Rating	SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT	Recommendations for improvement
		<p>testing effort. TMS will be monitoring the project to determine if execution activities are in alignment with the procedures stated in the System Test Plan.</p> <p>TMS has not been able to locate a defect management process that the project plans to follow. Additionally, we have not found any testing metrics or defects that have been opened in iCenter (the System Test Plan mentions that execution reports and an anomaly and defect log are stored in iCenter). TMS will work with the project to understand the location of these documents and assess them for next reporting period.</p>	
End-User Training		TMS will review the training documentation in the upcoming months.	
Implementation / Rollout Planning & Management		The Implementation plan has not yet been created.	



## CALTRANS - PRSM Project Oversight Review Checklist (August 2011)

### Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is October 2011 (per the last approved project schedule).

\*\* Please note the transition of IPOC vendor this reporting period. For this status report, Technology Management Solutions will retain the previous vendor's history of comments in order to help with the transition. Starting next reporting period, TMS will retain only our observations for the project.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
<b>Planning and Tracking</b>			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b> An updated SPR was approved by the OCIO on December 8, 2009. The OCIO has requested that Caltrans submit a new SPR for the schedule delay.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b> TMS has reviewed the last approved SPR and will review the new SPR request once available.</p>
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?		X	<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b> The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point.</p> <p>The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task.</p> <p>On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension and cost increase.</p> <p>On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope. The change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to</p>

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			<p>indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions.</p> <p>According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. Adaptation Phase activities (i.e., testing and data conversion) are scheduled to be completed by October 24, 2011. In addition, the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. This represents a delay of approximately 1 year and four months for Adaptation and approximately 10 months for the PRSM Project. It was noted in the PRSM Project Status meeting on May 25, 2011 that this PRSM Project schedule is the rebaselined schedule and has been updated to reflect new tasks and task durations. Caltrans is currently working on a new SPR for the schedule change, and once the SPR has been approved, the status of this item will be reflected as Adequate.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS understands the previous vendor's comments; however, we respectfully disagree with the deficient status of this item. The IPO checklist asks targeted questions regarding specific documentation in use on the project. It does not ask whether or not the project is on track (that status is documented in the IPOR). TMS believes this item should be marked as adequate based on the fact that the project does use a MS Project schedule to track the work. Tasks, milestones dates and estimated hours are documented within the schedule and the tasks, for the most part, are represented as manageable, trackable items with durations less than 80 hours. TMS is in the process of performing a detailed assessment on the project schedule in which we have made some observations, findings and recommendations; however, in general, we believe that the project has developed a well-structured schedule and uses the schedule on a regular basis to track progress. Next month, TMS will turn this item adequate.</p>
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> On a bi-weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and completion of planned tasks is updated as necessary.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the project schedule and attended three bi-weekly status meetings where updated schedules are provided and reviewed by the project team.</p>
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Actual hours are charged to a WBS and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system. An overall project WBS list of approximately 2,000 items exists in MS Excel.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has not yet reviewed the WBS. There is a folder for the WBS cost breakdown in iCenter; however, the folder is empty. TMS will work with the project to obtain the WBS and will review actual hours expended for the next reporting period.</p>
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> On a bi-weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u></p>

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans	X		<p>TMS has reviewed the project schedule and does attend the biweekly status meetings and agrees with the above assessment.</p> <p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u>                      Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team and the Implementation Vendor.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u>                      TMS has not been exposed to a formal staffing plan. We have reviewed the Project Organization Chart that documents the overall structure and high-level roles; however, a breakdown of specific staff on the vendor side and State side is not clear. Roles and responsibilities are defined within each project process plan (i.e. change management roles and responsibilities are defined within the Change Management Plan), however, TMS has not seen an overall description of the general roles and responsibilities for the project team (vendor and State). TMS has also not seen a plan describing the schedule for arrival and departure of staff over the course of the project or specific staff training plans (PRSM training plans for end users are underway, however, training for PRSM project team members has not been evidenced). TMS will work with the project team to obtain access to these items and to better understand the current staffing needs in September.</p>
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u>                      A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with a cost increase of \$947,422. Throughout June and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the potential cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved a cost increase of \$864,977 (\$464,977 from removing Years 2-3 Custom Code Maintenance and \$400,000 from "Unanticipated Cost").</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u>                      TMS has not been exposed to a project cost tracking worksheet that documents planned vs. actual expenditures on a monthly basis for each cost category documented in the SPR. TMS has reviewed the cost tracking that the project includes within the CA-PMM and observes that the actual expenditures are summarized as total amount "to-date". TMS will work with the project to understand the estimated monthly costs associated with the</p>

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate		Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration	
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?		N/A		N/A	remainder of the project.	
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?		N/A		N/A	This item is not applicable.	
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?		N/A		N/A	This item is not applicable.	
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?		X			<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has not been exposed to the referenced spreadsheet. We will work with the project team in September to come up to speed on the cost status for the project.</p>	
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?		X			<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS will work with the project to review the WBS and understand the cost tracking procedures in place on the project.</p>	
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?		X			<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> During status meetings, the PRSM Project Manager distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the project schedule and has attended bi-weekly project meetings. TMS has also reviewed the CA-PMM reports submitted by the project and agrees with the assessment above.</p>	
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?				X	<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products. Finalization of configuration requirements occurred in the September 2010 reporting period. There is an open issue on the PRSM Issue Log (Issue # 253) stating that although the Configuration Management Plan identifies a process for promotion of code and other configuration items, the process does not appear to be followed. The latest status of this issue states that the Implementation Vendor has updated the Plan and Caltrans has reviewed the plan and provided comments to the Project Manager. Per the PRSM Issue Log (dated July 27, 2011), the next step is for Caltrans to review and approve the Configuration Management Plan on 08/3/2011.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> The project team is in the final review of the Configuration Management Plan. TMS has reviewed this plan at a high level and found that there are some gaps in terms of the promotion process, specific roles and responsibilities for some of the configuration management tasks and a lack of configuration control for some of the</p>	

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		<p>project management process documentation. TMS is more concerned with the execution of configuration management and the concern that the project is not following the drafted procedures defined in the plan. TMS will work with the project to better understand the current issues in this area.</p> <p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis. As of May 18, 2011 the PRSM project team has begun utilizing a centralized repository to track and manage all potential and open issues.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS received a version of the Issue Management Plan but the file is corrupted. We have observed Issue management being executed on the project. TMS has been attending the bi-weekly Risk and Issues meetings where a detailed issue log is reviewed, action items defined and status reported. TMS will work with the project to obtain the Issue Management Plan. TMS agrees with the Adequate rating.</p>
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. In addition, Caltrans scheduled Implementation Team training sessions that provided the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. Training Session #1 occurred during the week of September 14, 2009. After completion of Session #1 training, the PRSM Project Team gathered feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and used the feedback to update and/or improve Training Session #2, which occurred during the week of September 28, 2009. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project. During Pilot and Roll Out, each district will have the opportunity to complete a user satisfaction survey.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> Through documentation review, it appears that users have been engaged in product reviews and training reviews and have participated in regular meetings to discuss organizational change management and pilot preparations. In addition, TMS observes that a Live Training demonstration was provided to some of the district users this reporting period and only some minor issues were identified. TMS will work with the project to understand more about the current level of involvement of the users and expected involvement in the upcoming months.</p>
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS respectfully disagrees with the previous IPOC vendor in that the PMBOK standards are adequate for the adaptation phase of the project. Although this project does not contain a typical design and development cycle, there are requirements, configuration and testing that need to be tracked and managed in a similar way to</p>



Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			<p>that of a typical development project. TMS has observed that a traceability matrix does exist that maps the RFP requirements to feature requirements to "to-be" processes (use cases) and onto test cases. This is a critical element to ensure that there is full coverage on the testing end and to ensure that all the user requirements and reports are implemented as planned. TMS did find that there are many features that are not mapped to "to-be" processes and more concerning is the observation that there are many "to-be" processes and features that are not mapped to test cases. TMS believes that a modified SDLC should have been adopted for the project that clearly identifies how validation of expected behavior will occur (i.e. description of the requirements management, configuration management and test management areas of the SDLC). At this phase in the project, it is probably not worth the project's time to create a document describing the methodology; however, TMS would recommend discussions and decisions to be made regarding a very tactical approach to validation of the product prior to the pilot phase. This would include review of the gaps in the traceability matrix to ensure proper testing coverage, weekly review of testing metrics to understand the current progress being made and clearly defined exit criteria as the project enters the pilot phase.</p>
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has not yet reviewed the RFQI.</p>
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Project is in the Adaptation Phase.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS agrees this item is not applicable during this phase of the project.</p>
<b>Procurement</b>			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the procurement documentation and agrees with the assessment above.</p>
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the procurement documentation and agrees with the assessment above.</p>



# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate		Deficient		Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?		X				<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the procurement documentation and agrees with the assessment above.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?		X				<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the procurement documentation and agrees with the assessment above.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?		N/A			N/A	<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the procurement documentation and agrees with the assessment above.
<b>Risk Management</b>						
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?		X				<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted May 2011. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager. Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis. As of May 18, 2011 the PRSM project team has begun utilizing a centralized repository to track and manage all potential and open risks. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the Risk Management Plan at a high-level and will perform a more detailed assessment during the month of September. We have attended the bi-weekly risk meetings and our initial observations are that risk management is being well executed on the project. Meetings are held regularly, risks are documented along with a mitigation/contingency plan, action items are reviewed and it appears that risks are escalated when needed.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least		X				<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u>

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
monthly?				Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS agrees with the above assessment.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X			<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS defers to the previous IPOC for how the initial risks were created. TMS will work with the project team to understand how risks are currently identified and whether there are any periodic formalized risk assessments using industry methodologies being done.
<b>Communication</b>				
Is there a written project communications plan?	X			<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the Communication Plan at a high-level and will provide a more detailed assessment during the month of September.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X			<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS was able to locate a status report folder on iCenter, however, it does not appear that reports have been filed in this area for almost a year. TMS has not reviewed the Advisory Committee status reports as mentioned above. TMS is aware that the project does formally report to CTA on a monthly basis and TMS has reviewed the CA-PMM reports for the last few months. TMS will work with the project team to better understand the expectations of receiving status reports from the vendor.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X			<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has reviewed the Risk Management Plan and there are written escalation procedures for risks.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X			<u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input. <u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS is aware that monthly Implementation Meetings are held with select district stakeholders. At the recommendation of the PRSM Project manager, TMS is not

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration	
			attending these meetings but is available to review status documentation or meeting minutes to determine the value-add in meeting stakeholder expectations about involvement in the deployment process.
<b>System Engineering</b>			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b> Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b> Through documentation review, it appears that users have been engaged in product reviews and training reviews and have participated in regular meetings to discuss organizational change management and pilot preparations. TMS will work with the project to understand more about the current level of involvement of the users and expected involvement in the upcoming months.</p>
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b> Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. In addition, the Implementation Vendor has been delivering a series of Checkpoints, which include a review of the PRSM configurations and design documentation. After each checkpoint, the PRSM Project Team gathers and consolidates their feedback on what was presented and provides it to the Implementation Vendor. The Implementation Vendor originally stated that there would be four (4) checkpoints over the course of the Adaptation Phase. In the March 2010 reporting period, the implementation Vendor stated that the remainder of the configurations would be presented in Checkpoint 4 or any of number of checkpoints needed. Checkpoint 4 was performed in April 2010. The walkthrough included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b> Through documentation review, it appears that users have been engaged in product reviews and training reviews and have participated in regular meetings to discuss organizational change management and pilot preparations. TMS will work with the project to understand more about the current level of involvement of the users and expected involvement in the upcoming months.</p>
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b> The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating</p>

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			<p>criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans is incorporating review cycles through the new checkpoint implementation approach.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>TMS has reviewed the current project schedule and observes that although it appears to have overlapping development, test and training phases, the work does not appear organized in terms of work packages or "gates" with clearly defined exit and approval milestones. TMS will work with the project to understand how the Gate Model is being used on the project and how the project schedule reflects the development methodology chosen.</p>
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>TMS has reviewed spreadsheets of requirements but is unaware of any other tool that is currently being used to manage requirements. Traceability matrices do exist and have been reviewed at a high level by TMS. The current versions in iCenter show significant gaps in traceability that the project needs to address.</p>
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>TMS has reviewed the Configuration Management Plan at a high-level and will complete a more in-depth assessment in the future. For this project, TMS agrees that the configuration related standards described in the Configuration Management Plan are sufficient.</p>
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.</p> <p><b>TMS IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>TMS needs to understand defect tracking and metrics associated with testing at a deeper level. We will work with the project team in September to gain a better understanding of the testing methodology in place and the associated defect reporting and tracking.</p>
Are formal code reviews conducted?	X		<p><b>Previous IPOC Comments:</b></p> <p>The PRSM Project Team has performed formal configuration reviews to occur during checkpoints throughout the Adaptation Phase. In the March 2010 reporting</p>

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		<p>period, the implementation Vendor stated that the remainder of the configurations would be presented in Checkpoint 4 or any of number of checkpoints needed. Checkpoint 4 was performed in April 2010. The walkthrough included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. In addition, IV&amp;V is currently performing code reviews and is planning to work with Caltrans IT to finalize code review process.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has not been exposed to any code review documentation or Checkpoint 4 review documentation. We will work with the project team to better understand this process for the next reporting period.</p> <p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS did locate a Quality Management Plan on iCenter and will review this plan during September and provide an assessment. TMS believes that quality assurance procedures deal with more than just deliverable assessment.</p>
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Project is in the Adaptation Phase</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS agrees this item is not applicable for this phase.</p>
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS has not been exposed to the enterprise architecture plan but will work with the project team to gain access.</p>
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		<p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> PCR's 8 (modifications to technical requirements related to Work Package 1) and 9 (deletion of technical requirements or parts of technical requirements, which are obsolete, redundant, or no longer needed) were approved in the June 2010 reporting period. PCR 12 (remainder of requirements not covered in PCR's 8 or 9) was approved in the August 2010 reporting period. Per the new baseline schedule (dated August 31, 2010), the Requirements Baseline effort was completed on August 24, 2010. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&amp;V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes.</p> <p>IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.</p>

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		<p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> Upon review of the project schedule, it appears that formal deliverable inspections are conducted for critical milestones of the project. TMS will work with the project team to understand the current status of the "as-is" and "to-be" business process documentation.</p> <p><u>Previous IPOC Comments:</u> The IV&amp;V Contract was approved and the IV&amp;V Vendor began work in April 2008.</p> <p><u>TMS IPOC Comments:</u> TMS agrees with this assessment.</p>

## IPO Report for July 2011

**Project Name:** Caltrans PRSM

**Assessment Date:** July 29, 2011

**Frequency:** Monthly

### Oversight Provider Information

**Oversight Leader:** Greg Thomas

**Organization:** Deloitte & Touche LLP

**Phone Number:** 415 783 5211

**Email:** [grethomas@deloitte.com](mailto:grethomas@deloitte.com)

### Project Information

**Project Number:** 2660-160

**Department:** Transportation (Caltrans)

**Criticality:** High

**Agency:** Business, Transportation & Housing

**Last Approved Document/Date:** SPR (12/08/09)

**Total One-time Cost:** \$26,078,375

**Start Date:** June 7, 2000

**End Date:** June 13, 2011

**Project Manager:** David Youmans

**Organization:** Caltrans

**Phone Number:** 916.826.4425

**Email:** [david.youmans@dot.ca.gov](mailto:david.youmans@dot.ca.gov)

### Summary: Current Status

**Project Phase:** Adaptation

**Planned Start Date:** May 20, 2009

**Planned End Date:** November 23, 2010

**Actual Start Date:** July 1, 2009

**Forecasted End Date:** October 24, 2011

### Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last Finance approved document.

**Ahead-of-schedule:**

One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%).  
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

**Behind Schedule**

**On-schedule:**

All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.  
(Within 5%)

**Behind Schedule:**

One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

**Comments:** A new baseline schedule was set with the approved Special Project Report (SPR) dated December 8, 2009. The SPR stated the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010 and the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. Throughout June and July, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the change request. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension and cost increase. The PRSM Change Control Board created

Project Change Request (PCR) 14 to track the non-technical (cost and schedule) changes associated with the Implementation Vendor change request. PCR 14 was approved by the PRSM Change Control Board, pending finalization and approval of the draft PRSM project schedule, on August 24, 2010. On September 1, 2010, the Implementation Vendor approved the new baseline schedule.

On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope (please note there was no requested change to schedule or overall PRSM project cost). The change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. The activities the Implementation Vendor proposed to change and/or move to Pilot include Data Conversion, System End to End Testing, Implementation Team Training, Technical Training, and Report Development. In addition, the Implementation Vendor proposed to decrease the amount of their support during Roll Out since they will be providing more up front support during Pilot.

After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. Although the schedule has been updated to reflect the original contract provisions, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are still in negotiations regarding the re-scope proposal. There are several key project activities, such as planning for the PRSM training program, that are dependent upon the outcome of the re-scope proposal so it is important that the re-scope proposal negotiations are settled timely, and that the outcome is used to clarify the project plan and critical project activities. In addition, during the week of January 24th, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables that were previously in draft form. These deliverables include the Data Initialization Plan (DIP), Pilot Plan, and System Test Plan. For information on the status of these deliverables, please refer to the **General Comments** section at the end of this report.

As part of the approval of the August 2010 approved Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. During the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies (defects) identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. In order to address the delay in the Adaption phase, an Executive Task Force was formed and PCR 16 was opened on April 6, 2011 to develop and track the status of the plan to move forward with the project (known as the Go Forward Plan). As part of PCR 16, the project schedule was rebaselined and detailed various next steps including data conversions, report development, and training.

As of June 21, 2011 PCR 16 was approved and closed. As part of the rebaselined schedule (dated June 22, 2011) from PCR 16, the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. Adaptation Phase activities (i.e., testing and data conversion) are scheduled to be completed by October 24, 2011. In addition, the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. This represents a delay of approximately 1 year and three months for Adaptation and approximately 10 months for the PRSM Project. The OCIO has requested that Caltrans submit a Special Project Request (SPR) for the schedule delay. Caltrans is currently working on a new SPR for the schedule change, and once the SPR has been approved, the status of the schedule will be reflected as On-Schedule. Please refer to the table below.

We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur. Please refer to the PRSM Project Schedule issue in the **Issue** section below for information regarding further potential impacts to the schedule.

Document	End of Adaptation Phase	End of Project
SPR (dated 12/08/09)	02/2010	06/13/2011
Executive Steering Committee Approved Schedule (dated 09/01/2010)	11/23/2010	02/14/2012
Current Schedule (dated 06/22/2011)	10/24/2011	12/21/2012 (Statewide Rollout Acceptance)



**Resources (Level of Effort)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Fewer Resources**

Completion of one or more major tasks and / or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

**Within Resources**

All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

**More Resources**

**More Resources**

Completion of major tasks and / or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

**Comments:** In the February 2011 reporting period, a new Implementation Vendor Project Manager joined the PRSM Project Team. In the March 2011 reporting period, a few of the PRSM Project Team roles were updated. The previous IT Lead is now the Release Manager and Configuration Manager. A new team member was brought on to the project to fill in as the new IT Lead. In addition, during the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay in Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies (defects) identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. There are three current resource concerns associated with the Adaptation Phase: (1) The testing team has noted that some of the anomalies identified during testing represent questions regarding system functionality. During the beginning of testing, a business analyst was not on-hand to support the testing team. In addition, the system has not been documented from a user or tester perspective, which would assist in providing a guide to how the system should function. If an issue arose during testing, the testers were unsure if it was a defect or how the system should function. Although the Implementation Vendor has provided an Architect that is available to assist the testing team during half of their sessions and is also on-call to answer any questions that arise, additional business resources may be needed during testing.; (2) Due to the number of anomalies found during configuration testing, additional time has been built into the schedule. Caltrans has added two (2) additional resources to assist with the testing effort (one to assist with Configuration Testing and the other to assist with Integration Testing). In order to mitigate future schedule delays, additional resources may be needed to resolve anomalies and assist in the testing effort; (3) the current status of the conversion effort as a whole has not been reported clearly during the PRSM Project Status Meetings. This is partially due to the fact that there is not a single point of contact / owner for the Data Conversion effort. In order for Data Conversion to be successful, an owner needs to be identified to manage the effort. In the March 2011 reporting period, an owner was identified to manage the Data Conversion effort and report on the status. In addition, the PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of July. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. We will continue to closely monitor the resource status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur.

**Resources (Budget/Cost)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Less cost**

The project is (>5%) under budget.

**Within cost**

The project is operating within budget.

**Within Cost**

**Higher cost**

Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

**Comments:** A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with a cost increase of \$947,422. Throughout June and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the potential cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved a cost increase of \$864,977 (\$464,977 from removing Years 2-3 Custom Code Maintenance and \$400,000 from "Unanticipated Cost"). The Implementation Vendor's change request is linked to the following PRSM PCR's: PCR 13 (Changes from FIDO to EFIS Interface – Technical Requirements) and PCR 14 (Changes from FIDO

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

to EFIS Interface – Non-Technical Requirements), which have been approved by the PRSM Change Control Board.

**Quality (Client Functionality)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Adequately Defined**

Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

**Inadequately Defined**

**Inadequately Defined**

One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

**Comments:** At this point in time, given the delays in testing, it is unclear if the required functionality has been successfully built into the system. There is a concern that test scripts may not adequately reflect requirements. During the January reporting period, we reported that out of 334 total requirements, 15 have been fully satisfied and 16 have been partially satisfied (303 have not been satisfied). In addition, out of a total of 99 test scripts, 19 have been executed and 20 have been informally executed (60 have not been executed). Please note that updated metrics have not been provided since February 2011. During the month of May, Caltrans analyzed developed test cases to determine if they would satisfy requirements. For requirements that were not addressed by the developed test cases, Caltrans plans to develop new test cases. Further, configuration testing will be restarted and all test cases will be executed prior to the end of the Adaptation phase. For more information, please refer to **Issue I-4: Configuration Testing**.

In addition, there have been a significant number of problems associated with data conversions. Per the PRSM Risks & Issues Status Meeting on 07/27/2011, data conversion testing activities are still in progress and issues have been identified (i.e., issue #255). Data Conversion activities are being performed for project data and historical data. During the weekly PRSM Project Status Meetings, the PRSM Project Team has noted that legacy data has presented some challenges and there have been some issues with loading the data. If the issues of data cleansing and data load are not mitigated or resolved prior to Pilot and roll out, there is a possibility that only a small sub-set of projects will load correctly. The PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of July. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. We will continue to monitor this area closely and report any updates as they occur. For more information, please refer to **Issue I-3: Data Conversions**.

**Quality (Architecture/System Performance)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Adequately Defined**

The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

**Adequately Defined**

**Inadequately Defined**

The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

**Comments:** System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. The Production environment hardware has been configured and turned over to Caltrans. The Implementation Vendor submitted an Application Installation-Platform Acceptance Report, which was approved after revisions were made. The PRSM Project Team has renewed Oracle licenses and they are currently in the process of planning Help Desk support activities, which will be used to provide support to the districts post implementation.

### New Issues

There are no new issues.

## Issues

### Issue I-4: Configuration Testing

**Issue Statement:** There have been many unexpected problems with the Configuration Testing component of the project (see the Comments under the Quality section above). The number of defects/anomalies and slow progress of Configuration Testing is causing additional schedule delays as configuration testing is in the critical path for entering the Pilot phase of the project.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: David Cordone

#### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- I-4a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team develop a remediation plan for testing the issues and recommendations identified in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis.
- I-4b - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team apply additional resources if necessary to expedite the Configuration Testing. The PRSM project team should keep the Executive Steering Committee informed of the status of this issue and request additional resources if necessary.

#### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: Configuration testing restarted the week of 07/08/2011 and is currently in progress. There are approximately 50 different configuration changes currently being tested and worked on. In addition, per the Caltrans Unit Testing Status (Week Ending 7/08/11), all of the EFIS Unit Test cases and Staff Central Unit Test cases have been tested and passed.

June 11 Status: Per the rebaselined schedule, configuration testing was supposed to start on 06/20/11. However, due to the organizational breakdown structure changes in PRSM, configuration testing did not resume until 07/8/2011.

### New Issue I-3: Data Conversions

**Issue Statement:** There have been many unexpected problems with the dry-run data conversion process. For several of the Districts' pilot data, there has not been a successful dry-run to date. This may cause additional schedule delays and impact the quality of integration testing.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Jacquelyn Moore

#### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- I-3a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team develop a remediation plan for the data conversion issues and recommendations identified in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis.
- I-3b - IPOC recommends that additional resources (including a data conversion lead) to be applied as necessary to the data conversion effort in order to keep this component of the project on track. The PRSM project team should keep the Executive Steering Committee informed of the status of this issue and request additional resources if necessary.

#### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of July. They are currently working towards testing and resolving any issues. As of the last PRSM status meeting (07/20/2011), data conversion efforts are still focused on the Data Initialization Plan. The data dictionary and conversion plan have been completed and Caltrans is still working on the implementation plan. Per the current workplan, the implementation plan should be finalized and received by Caltrans by 08/01/2011.

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

**June 11 Status:** The Data Task Force met during the month of June. As of the last PRSM status meeting (06/22/2011), data conversion efforts are focused on the Data Initialization Plan. The data dictionary and conversion plan have been completed and Caltrans is still working on the implementation/test plan. Further, in the prior month, a sizing/capacity estimate of the test environment was performed using expenditure data and projects from District 4.

### **Issue I-2: PRSM Project Schedule**

**Issue Statement:** As part of the approval of the Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. During the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. Although additional time has been built into the schedule, if activities at the task level are not appropriately managed, it could result in additional delays. In addition, there is a risk that the Implementation Vendor could submit another change request for increased costs. Please refer to the **Schedule** section on page 1 for additional information.

**Impact:** High      **Time Frame:** Short Term      **Severity:** High      **Assigned to:** Kari Gutierrez

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- I-2a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team continue to evaluate the remaining testing and data conversion activities and build additional time into the PRSM Project Schedule as needed. Delays at the task and activity level should be recorded and tracked. In addition, delays that affect the critical path should be immediately discussed with members of the PRSM Project Management Team. If necessary, daily checkpoint meetings should be conducted to resolve issues that impact the critical path. Issues that cannot be resolved at the PRSM project team level should be escalated to the Executive Steering Committee immediately.
- I-2b - During the week of January 24<sup>th</sup>, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan (known as the go-forward plan) for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables by the end of February 2011. As of this IPOR, none of these deliverables have been finalized, however the project schedule has been partially updated to match the go-forward plan. IPOC recommends that Caltrans monitor the status of these deliverables and work with the Implementation Vendor to finalize them by the end of May 2011. Please refer to the **General Comments** section at the end of this IPOR for more information.
- I-2c - IPOC recommends that the progress of testing and data conversion should be reported in writing during the Status Meetings.

### **Status Update:**

**July 11 Status:** No new status.

**June 11 Status:** As of the last PRSM Project Status Meeting (dated 06/22/2011), the project schedule had been rebaselined to reflect the end of the Adaption phase milestone 10/24/2011.

### **Issue I-1: EFIS Interface (PCR 13)**

**Issue Statement:** The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and CTIPS are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. While developing to one standard interface presents a business opportunity, specifications and data requirements will need to be analyzed and documented. The development of the EFIS interface is a critical step for the PRSM project to proceed to the Pilot phase. EFIS went live in July 2010. The development of the EFIS interface could impact the cost of PRSM. There are two (2) potential scenarios related to this issue that could impact the schedule and / or cost: 1) the time compression in the transition of EFIS support from the EFIS Implementation Vendor to Caltrans could result in the EFIS Implementation Vendor fully focused on knowledge transfer and transition. The limited availability of EFIS resources could result in a delay in the development of the EFIS interface; and 2) with the focus on knowledge transfer and transition, PRSM is a lower priority for EFIS related support, which could result in resource constraints when it comes time to supporting the PRSM/EFIS interface/testing efforts.

**Impact:** High      **Time Frame:** Short Term      **Severity:** High      **Assigned to:** Jacqueline Moore

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

### IPOC Recommendations:

- I-2a PRSM interface acceptance criteria for entry to the Pilot phase should be agreed upon by the PRSM Project Team and Business Stakeholders. The criteria should include specifying the quality and completeness of the interfaces (degree of production readiness) before the Pilot phase.
- I-2b - Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

### Status Update:

July 11 Status: As of the last Caltrans Unit Test Status (dated 07/08/2011), Caltrans has completed unit testing for both EFIS and Staff Central.

June 11 Status: No new status.

## New Risks

### Risk R-4: PRSM Pilot Phase Readiness

**Risk Statement:** With the Adaptation phase projected to finish in October 2011, the pilot start date of [10/24/11] has been solidified in the work plan. If certain risks are realized during the remainder of the Adaption phase, or if the pilot districts are not well prepared, then success of the Pilot phase may be impacted.

Probability: Medium    Impact: High    Time Frame: Short Term    Severity: High    Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

### IPOC Recommendations:

- R-4a - Clearly identify, document, and get consensus on pilot entry and exit criteria in order to enable a smooth transition from Adaptation to Pilot.
- R-4b - Closely monitor risks and issues leading to Pilot. Any risks realized or issues that cannot be resolved should be escalated to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution immediately.
- R-4c - Ensure that communications with the pilot district leadership and stakeholders is fluid and frequent so that there are no surprises upon pilot entry and during the pilot phase.

## Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

### Risk R-3: PRSM Project Costs

**Risk Statement:** With the previous delays in the PRSM project schedule and the remaining Adaptation activities (i.e., data conversion and testing) there is a possibility of another schedule delay. The possibility of another delay in the PRSM project schedule could have an impact on the cost of the project.

Probability: Medium    Impact: High    Time Frame: Short Term    Severity: High    Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

#### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- R-3a – IPOC recommends that the current delay in Adaptation and the potential additional delays be discussed with the Executive Steering Committee. Upon review of the previous approved Implementation Vendor change request, if it is deemed likely that another change request for cost will be submitted, discussions with the Implementation Vendor should occur immediately.
- R-3b - IPOC recommends that potential Caltrans resource needs / cost impacts are assessed given the delay in Adaptation. These resource and potential cost impacts should be discussed with the executive steering committee.

#### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: As of the July 2011 reporting period, there has not been an increase in costs.

June 11 Status: As of the June 2011 reporting period, there has not been an increase in costs.

### Risk R-2: Resource Availability

**Risk Statement:** Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium    Impact: Medium    Time Frame: Short    Severity: Medium    Assigned to: Kari Gutierrez

#### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- R-2a - After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.
- R-2b - Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

#### **Status Update:**

July 11 Status: No new status.

June 11 Status: No new status. In the March 2011 reporting period, a few of the PRSM Project Team roles were updated. The previous IT Lead became the Release Manager and Configuration Manager. A new team member was brought on to the project to fill in as the new IT Lead. During the February 2011 reporting period, a new Implementation Vendor Project Manager joined the PRSM Project Team. The previous Implementation Vendor Project Manager will stay on board to assist in the transition process. During the January 2011 reporting period, the Implementation Vendor has provided an Architect that is available to assist the testing team during half of their sessions and is on-call to answer questions. In addition, Caltrans has added two (2) additional resources to assist with the testing effort (one to assist with Configuration Testing and the other to assist with Integration Testing). Please refer to the **Resource** section on page 2 for additional information. As of the month of May, the Release Manager and Configuration Manager has transitioned back to the IT Lead

### Risk R-1: Business Process Changes and Organizational Change Management

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

**Risk Statement:** One of the most significant challenges to the PRSM Project could be engaging and obtaining buy-in from District executives, management and staff. It is very important that District executives and management are knowledgeable about PRSM and the changes to their business processes and benefits of using PRSM. District staff, in addition to training, should be knowledgeable of the decisions and consequences of changing / standardizing business processes. Lack of engagement of District personnel at all levels could have a negative impact on overall PRSM system acceptance and usage.

Probability: High                      Impact: High                      Time Frame: Med                      Severity: High                      Assigned to: David Youmans

### IPOC Recommendations:

- R-1a - Define the process for gaining District consensus on policies, new business rules and business processes. The process should describe how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.
- R-1b - Modify the format of the monthly Implementation Manager's Video Conference Meeting to begin utilizing this forum as a mechanism for Organizational Change Management. As PRSM gets closer to District roll out, change the frequency of these meetings to bi-weekly.
- R-1c - Assess the changes to the training program/plan proposed in the most recent implementation vendor change request in order to understand the impact on Organizational Change Management. Work with the Districts to help them understand the changes to the training program in order to gain organizational buy-in and confirm that the program is adequate to enable a successful Roll Out.
- R-1d - Assess the impact of the Implementation Vendor Change Request on Organizational Change Management.
- R-1e - Consider hiring / extending additional consulting resources to assist with refining the Organizational Change Management Plan and to execute the plan.

### Status Update:

July 11 Status:        The PRSM Prep Course was delivered in July 2011 to the Implementation Managers.

June 11 Status:        No new status. During the May reporting period, an outline of the PRSM Prep Course was presented during the Implementation Manager's meeting. On 5/26, a trial run of the course occurred with approximately 20 Caltrans Headquarters staff that were not involved with the PRSM project. Caltrans is currently aiming to deliver an expanded PRSM Prep Course during the month of July via video conference to Implementation Managers. During the April reporting period, IPOC met with the Organizational Change Management Team and discussed the plan for preparing for and implementing organizational change management at the districts. During this meeting, IPOC provided comments and recommendations to enhance the plan. In addition, IPOC was provided with the Draft Organizational Change Management Plan and provided comments.

### General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy. IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of May, including PRSM Status meetings, PRSM Risk and Issues meetings and PRSM Project Managers meeting.

On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. Throughout June 2010 and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the change request. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension (approximately 5 months) and cost increase. On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope (please note there is no change to schedule or cost). This change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. The goal for this is to keep activities in Adaptation that can be completed prior to November 23<sup>rd</sup> and move the remaining activities into early Pilot. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. In addition, during the week of January 24th, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables that were previously in draft form. These deliverables include the Data Initialization Plan (DIP), Pilot Plan, and System Test Plan and were scheduled to be completed in February 2011. As of the June 22<sup>nd</sup> PRSM Project Status Meeting, only the System Test Plan was agreed upon and finalized. The DIP and the Pilot Plan were still in progress and have not been completed. As of July 2011, the Pilot Plan was being worked on by both the Implementation Vendor's and Caltrans' Implementation Managers. The

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Implementation managers are projected to be completed with their revisions to the Pilot Plan by the end of August 2011, with the finalized Pilot Plan being available by the end of September 2011. In addition, the Data Initialization Plan (DIP) has been divided into three (3) components: Data Dictionary, Conversion, and Implementation plan. The Data Dictionary and Conversion plans have been completed. The Implementation plan component of the DIP is in progress and is projected to be completed by early August 2011. For more information on the data conversion issues, please refer to **Issue I-3: Data Conversions**.

As part of the approval of the August 2010 approved Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011 and the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. Please refer to the **Schedule** Section on Page 1 for additional information.

In the July 2010 reporting period, the PRSM project was re-organized so that the Project Management function is now under IT and a new Project Manager has been assigned to PRSM. This new Project Manager will be responsible for the day to day, hands-on project management activities for PRSM. The Project Management function was previously under the Division of Project Management. With the re-organization, the previous Project Manager is now providing oversight as the Project Director.

A number of project processes have been modified since the change in Project Management structure in July 2010. The PRSM Project Schedule, which was previously managed by the Implementation Vendor, is now managed by Caltrans. The new Project Manager has added baseline start and finish columns to the schedule to track baseline completion dates against actual completion dates. During the bi-weekly PRSM Project Status Meetings, the new Project Manager has allocated time in the agenda for each of the PRSM Project Team Workgroups (such as Configuration, Interfaces, Conversion, etc.) to conduct brief status updates of their current tasks, risks, and issues. Beginning in May 2011, the structure of the PRSM Project Status meetings will change. Going forward, attendees of the status meetings will only include PRSM Project Managers and Oversight vendors. The purpose of these meetings will be to provide a status update of each area of the project, without going into the task level detail of the work plan. In addition to these meetings, another weekly meeting will be scheduled for each area (i.e., testing, training). During these meetings, team members will update the schedule based on their assigned activities and provide updates to their team lead.

In addition to the bi-weekly PRSM Status meetings and the bi-weekly PRSM Risk and Issues meetings, PRSM Change Management meetings occur on a weekly basis if there are open changes to discuss. During these meetings new and open project change requests (PCR's) are discussed by PRSM Project Management and the Implementation Vendor Project Manager. As of the 07/19/2011 PRSM Project PCR Log, there were no recently opened PCRs, three PCRS in progress (15: Update Training Plan; 20: Update to Configuration Management Plan, and 21: Updated To\_Be Business Processes from version 2.3 to 3.0), and no recently closed PCRs.

In August 2010, the Caltrans Enterprise Technology Investment Division requested that IPOC perform a health check assessment on the PRSM project. The objective of the health check assessment was to provide a point in time assessment of the PRSM project and identify findings, risks and recommendations associated with Project Management and Systems Development Lifecycle (SDLC) areas. IPOC activities performed for the Health Check assessment included interviewing key project team members and reviewing project documentation. On October 7, 2010, IPOC submitted the finalized Health Check report to Caltrans.



## CALTRANS - PRSM Project Oversight Review Checklist (July 2011)

### Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is October 2011 (per the last approved project schedule).

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
<b>Planning and Tracking</b>			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		An updated SPR was approved by the OCIO on December 8, 2009. The OCIO has requested that Caltrans submit a new SPR for the schedule delay.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software?		X	The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point.
Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?			The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task.
			On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension and cost increase.
			On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope. The change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions.
			According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. Adaptation Phase activities (i.e., testing and data conversion) are scheduled to be completed by October 24, 2011. In addition, the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. This represents a delay of

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products			Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
					approximately 1 year and four months for Adaptation and approximately 10 months for the PRSM Project. It was noted in the PRSM Project Status meeting on May 25, 2011 that this PRSM Project schedule is the rebaselined schedule and has been updated to reflect new tasks and task durations. Caltrans is currently working on a new SPR for the schedule change, and once the SPR has been approved, the status of this item will be reflected as Adequate.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?		X			On a bi-weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and completion of planned tasks is updated as necessary.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X			Actual hours are charged to a WBS and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system. An overall project WBS list of approximately 2,000 items exists in MS Excel.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X			On a bi-weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X			Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team and the Implementation Vendor.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?		X			A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with a cost increase of \$947,422. Throughout June and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the potential cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved a cost increase of \$864,977 (\$464,977 from removing Years 2-3 Custom Code Maintenance and \$400,000 from "Unanticipated Cost").
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?		N/A		N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?		N/A		N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?		N/A		N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?		X			A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?		X			Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?		X			During status meetings, the PRSM Project Manager distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal				X	The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. The current

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products			Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration	
Adequate	Deficient			
configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?				Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products. Finalization of configuration requirements occurred in the September 2010 reporting period. There is an open issue on the PRSM Issue Log (Issue # 253) stating that although the Configuration Management Plan identifies a process for promotion of code and other configuration items, the process does not appear to be followed. The latest status of this issue states that the Implementation Vendor has updated the Plan and Caltrans has reviewed the plan and provided comments to the Project Manager. Per the PRSM Issue Log (dated July 27, 2011), the next step is for Caltrans to review and approve the Configuration Management Plan on 08/3/2011.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X			An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis. As of May 18, 2011 the PRSM project team has begun utilizing a centralized repository to track and manage all potential and open issues.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X			Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. In addition, Caltrans scheduled Implementation Team training sessions that provided the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. Training Session #1 occurred during the week of September 14, 2009. After completion of Session #1 training, the PRSM Project Team gathered feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and used the feedback to update and/or improve Training Session #2, which occurred during the week of September 28, 2009. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project. During Pilot and Roll Out, each district will have the opportunity to complete a user satisfaction survey.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X			Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X			The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A		N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
<b>Procurement</b>				
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X			The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X			Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X			Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?		X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?		N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
<b>Risk Management</b>				
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?		X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted May 2011. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager. Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis.  As of May 18, 2011 the PRSM project team has begun utilizing a centralized repository to track and manage all potential and open risks.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?		X		Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?		X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy.
<b>Communication</b>				
Is there a written project communications plan?		X		The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?		X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?		X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?		X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
<b>System Engineering</b>				
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?		X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?		X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. In addition, the Implementation Vendor has been delivering a series of Checkpoints.

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			<p>which include a review of the PRSM configurations and design documentation. After each checkpoint, the PRSM Project Team gathers and consolidates their feedback on what was presented and provides it to the Implementation Vendor. The Implementation Vendor originally stated that there would be four (4) checkpoints over the course of the Adaptation Phase. In the March 2010 reporting period, the implementation Vendor stated that the remainder of the configurations would be presented in Checkpoint 4 or any of number of checkpoints needed. Checkpoint 4 was performed in April 2010. The walkthrough included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor.</p>
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		<p>The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans is incorporating review cycles through the new checkpoint implementation approach.</p>
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		<p>An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.</p>
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		<p>Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.</p>
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		<p>The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.</p>
Are formal code reviews conducted?	X		<p>The PRSM Project Team has performed formal configuration reviews to occur during checkpoints throughout the Adaptation Phase. In the March 2010 reporting period, the implementation Vendor stated that the remainder of the configurations would be presented in Checkpoint 4 or any of number of checkpoints needed. Checkpoint 4 was performed in April 2010. The walkthrough included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. In addition, IV&amp;V is currently performing code reviews and is planning to work with Caltrans IT to finalize code review process.</p>
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		<p>The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are</p>

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?		N/A	N/A	three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State. Project is in the Adaptation Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?		X		Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?		X		PCR's 8 (modifications to technical requirements related to Work Package 1) and 9 (deletion of technical requirements or parts of technical requirements, which are obsolete, redundant, or no longer needed) were approved in the June 2010 reporting period. PCR 12 (remainder of requirements not covered in PCR's 8 or 9) was approved in the August 2010 reporting period. Per the new baseline schedule (dated August 31, 2010), the Requirements Baseline effort was completed on August 24, 2010. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?		X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.

## IPO Report for June 2011

**Project Name:** Caltrans PRSM

**Assessment Date:** June 30, 2011

**Frequency:** Monthly

### Oversight Provider Information

**Oversight Leader:** Greg Thomas

**Organization:** Deloitte & Touche LLP

**Phone Number:** 415 783 5211

**Email:** [grethomas@deloitte.com](mailto:grethomas@deloitte.com)

### Project Information

**Project Number:** 2660-160

**Department:** Transportation (Caltrans)

**Criticality:** High

**Agency:** Business, Transportation & Housing

**Last Approved Document/Date:** SPR (12/08/09)

**Total One-time Cost:** \$26,078,375

**Start Date:** June 7, 2000

**End Date:** June 13, 2011

**Project Manager:** David Youmans

**Organization:** Caltrans

**Phone Number:** 916.826.4425

**Email:** [david\\_youmans@dot.ca.gov](mailto:david_youmans@dot.ca.gov)

### Summary: Current Status

**Project Phase:** Adaptation

**Planned Start Date:** May 20, 2009

**Planned End Date:** November 23, 2010

**Actual Start Date:** July 1, 2009

**Forecasted End Date:** October 24, 2011

### Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last Finance approved document.

**Ahead-of-schedule:**

One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%).  
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

**Behind Schedule**

**On-schedule:**

All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.  
(Within 5%)

**Behind Schedule:**

One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

**Comments:**

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved Special Project Report (SPR) dated December 8, 2009. The SPR stated the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010 and the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. Throughout June and July, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the change request. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee

approved the schedule extension and cost increase. The PRSM Change Control Board created Project Change Request (PCR) 14 to track the non-technical (cost and schedule) changes associated with the Implementation Vendor change request. PCR 14 was approved by the PRSM Change Control Board, pending finalization and approval of the draft PRSM project schedule, on August 24, 2010. On September 1, 2010, the Implementation Vendor approved the new baseline schedule.

On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope (please note there was no requested change to schedule or overall PRSM project cost). The change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. The activities the Implementation Vendor proposed to change and/or move to Pilot include Data Conversion, System End to End Testing, Implementation Team Training, Technical Training, and Report Development. In addition, the Implementation Vendor proposed to decrease the amount of their support during Roll Out since they will be providing more up front support during Pilot.

After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. Although the schedule has been updated to reflect the original contract provisions, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are still in negotiations regarding the re-scope proposal. There are several key project activities, such as planning for the PRSM training program, that are dependent upon the outcome of the re-scope proposal so it is important that the re-scope proposal negotiations are settled timely, and that the outcome is used to clarify the project plan and critical project activities. In addition, during the week of January 24th, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables that were previously in draft form. These deliverables include the Data Initialization Plan (DIP), Pilot Plan, and System Test Plan. For information on the status of these deliverables, please refer to the **General Comments** section at the end of this report.

As part of the approval of the August 2010 approved Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. During the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies (defects) identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. In order to address the delay in the Adaption phase, an Executive Task Force was formed and PCR 16 was opened on April 6, 2011 to develop and track the status of the plan to move forward with the project (known as the Go Forward Plan). As part of PCR 16, the project schedule was rebaselined and detailed various next steps including data conversions, report development, and training.

As of June 21, 2011 PCR 16 was approved and closed. As part of the rebaselined schedule (dated June 22, 2011) from PCR 16, the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. Adaptation Phase activities (i.e., testing and data conversion) are scheduled to be completed by October 24, 2011. In addition, the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. This represents a delay of approximately 1 year and three months for Adaptation and approximately 10 months for the PRSM Project. The OCIO has requested that Caltrans submit a Special Project Request (SPR) for the schedule delay. Caltrans is currently working on a new SPR for the schedule change, and once the SPR has been approved, the status of the schedule will be reflected as On-Schedule. Please refer to the table below.

We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur. Please refer to the PRSM Project Schedule issue in the **Issue** section below for information regarding further potential impacts to the schedule.

Document	End of Adaptation Phase	End of Project
SPR (dated 12/08/09)	02/2010	06/13/2011
Executive Steering Committee Approved Schedule (dated 09/01/2010)	11/23/2010	02/14/2012
Current Schedule (dated 06/22/2011)	10/24/2011	12/21/2012 (Statewide Rollout Acceptance)



**Resources (Level of Effort)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Fewer Resources**

Completion of one or more major tasks and / or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

**Within Resources**

All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

**More Resources**

**More Resources**

Completion of major tasks and / or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

**Comments:** In the February 2011 reporting period, a new Implementation Vendor Project Manager joined the PRSM Project Team. In the March 2011 reporting period, a few of the PRSM Project Team roles were updated. The previous IT Lead is now the Release Manager and Configuration Manager. A new team member was brought on to the project to fill in as the new IT Lead. In addition, during the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay in Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies (defects) identified during configuration testing and issues regarding data conversion. There are three current resource concerns associated with the Adaptation Phase: (1) The testing team has noted that some of the anomalies identified during testing represent questions regarding system functionality. During the beginning of testing, a business analyst was not on-hand to support the testing team. In addition, the system has not been documented from a user or tester perspective, which would assist in providing a guide to how the system should function. If an issue arose during testing, the testers were unsure if it was a defect or how the system should function. Although the Implementation Vendor has provided an Architect that is available to assist the testing team during half of their sessions and is also on-call to answer any questions that arise, additional business resources may be needed during testing.; (2) Due to the number of anomalies found during configuration testing, additional time has been built into the schedule. Caltrans has added two (2) additional resources to assist with the testing effort (one to assist with Configuration Testing and the other to assist with Integration Testing). In order to mitigate future schedule delays, additional resources may be needed to resolve anomalies and assist in the testing effort; (3) the current status of the conversion effort as a whole has not been reported clearly during the PRSM Project Status Meetings. This is partially due to the fact that there is not a single point of contact / owner for the Data Conversion effort. In order for Data Conversion to be successful, an owner needs to be identified to manage the effort. In the March 2011 reporting period, an owner was identified to manage the Data Conversion effort and report on the status. In addition, the PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of June. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. We will continue to closely monitor the resource status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur.

**Resources (Budget/Cost)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Less cost**

The project is (>5%) under budget.

**Within Cost**

**Within cost**

The project is operating within budget.

**Higher cost**

Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

**Comments:** A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with a cost increase of \$947,422. Throughout June and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the potential cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved a cost increase of \$864,977 (\$464,977 from removing Years 2-3 Custom Code Maintenance and \$400,000 from "Unanticipated Cost"). The Implementation Vendor's change request is linked to the following PRSM PCR's: PCR 13 (Changes from FIDO to EFIS Interface – Technical Requirements) and PCR 14 (Changes from FIDO to EFIS Interface – Non-Technical Requirements), which have been approved by the PRSM Change Control Board.

**Quality (Client Functionality)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Adequately Defined**

Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

**Inadequately Defined**

**Inadequately Defined**

One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

**Comments:** At this point in time, given the delays in testing, it is unclear if the required functionality has been successfully built into the system. There is a concern that test scripts may not adequately reflect requirements. During the January reporting period, we reported that out of 334 total requirements, 15 have been fully satisfied and 16 have been partially satisfied (303 have not been satisfied). In addition, out of a total of 99 test scripts, 19 have been executed and 20 have been informally executed (60 have not been executed). Please note that updated metrics were not provided in February, March, April, or May 2011. During the month of May, Caltrans analyzed developed test cases to determine if they would satisfy requirements. For requirements that were not addressed by the developed test cases, Caltrans plans to develop new test cases. Further, configuration testing will be restarted and all test cases will be executed prior to the end of the Adaptation phase. For more information, please refer to **Issue I-4: Configuration Testing**.

In addition, there have been a significant number of problems associated with data conversions. Per the PRSM Project Schedule (dated 06/22/2011), Data Conversion testing activities are scheduled to be completed by 07/27/2011. Data Conversion activities are being performed for project data and historical data. Currently the PRSM Project Team has completed a load for District 4 data and performed a capacity analysis. During the weekly PRSM Project Status Meetings, the PRSM Project Team has noted that legacy data has presented some challenges and there have been some issues with loading the data. If the issues of data cleansing and data load are not mitigated or resolved prior to Pilot and roll out, there is a possibility that only a small sub-set of projects will load correctly. The PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of June. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. We will continue to monitor this area closely and report any updates as they occur. For more information, please refer to **Issue I-3: Data Conversions**.

**Quality (Architecture/System Performance)** Choose the statement that most closely applies.

**Adequately Defined**

The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

**Adequately Defined**

**Inadequately Defined**

The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

**Comments:** System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. The Production environment hardware has been configured and turned over to Caltrans. The Implementation Vendor submitted an Application Installation-Platform Acceptance Report, which was approved after revisions were made. Currently the PRSM Project Team is working on renewing Oracle licenses. They are also planning Help Desk support activities, which will be used to provide support to the districts post implementation.

**New Issues**

There are no new issues.

**Issues**

**Issue I-4: Configuration Testing**

**Issue Statement:** There have been many unexpected problems with the Configuration Testing component of the project (see the Comments under the Quality section above). The number of defects/anomalies and slow progress of Configuration Testing is causing additional schedule delays as configuration testing is in the critical path for entering the Pilot phase of the project.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: David Cordone

**IPOC Recommendations:**

- I-4a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team develop a remediation plan for testing the issues and recommendations identified in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis.
- I-4b - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team apply additional resources if necessary to expedite the Configuration Testing. The PRSM project team should keep the Executive Steering Committee informed of the status of this issue and request additional resources if necessary.

**Status Update:**

**June 11 Status:** Per the rebaselined schedule, configuration testing was supposed to start on 06/20/11. However, due to the organizational breakdown structure changes in PRSM, configuration testing cannot resume until 07/8/2011.

**May 11 Status:** Configuration testing is still on hold pending the outcome of the re-scope proposal, organizational breakdown structure changes, and also pending the resolution of the issues with Data Conversion. In the meantime, the test team is performing Unit Testing and expanding on test documentation. As of the PRSM interface status meeting (6/3/2011), 100% of EFIS Unit Test Scripts had passed and 63% of Staff Central Unit Test Scripts had passed. One of IPOC's recommendations in the January 2011 IPOR was that the PRSM Project Team perform a root cause analysis for the configuration testing delays. The PRSM Project team then requested that IV&V perform the root cause analysis. In February 2011, IV&V performed and submitted the root cause analysis report. During the analysis IPOC and the PRSM Project Team provided comments and feedback. Within the analysis, IV&V

identified the current state of testing, current challenges, root causes, and recommendations. Some of the key points from this analysis are that the test plan, which is supposed to guide the method of all phases of testing, has not been finalized due to a number of conflicting points between Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor and testing responsibilities have not been agreed upon. In addition, configuration testing is dependent on good data. Current issues with the data have prevented progress with configuration testing, which has been on hold for approximately three months. If the issues with the data are not resolved, it will impact the testing effort and will cause additional delays in the schedule.

### **New Issue I-3: Data Conversions**

**Issue Statement:** There have been many unexpected problems with the dry-run data conversion process. For several of the Districts' pilot data, there has not been a successful dry-run to date. This may cause additional schedule delays and impact the quality of integration testing.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Jacquelyn Moore

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- I-3a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team develop a remediation plan for the data conversion issues and recommendations identified in the IV&V Root Cause Analysis.
- I-3b - IPOC recommends that additional resources (including a data conversion lead) to be applied as necessary to the data conversion effort in order to keep this component of the project on track. The PRSM project team should keep the Executive Steering Committee informed of the status of this issue and request additional resources if necessary.

### **Status Update:**

- June 11 Status:** The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of June. They have compiled a list of issues and are currently working towards testing and resolving the issues. As of the last PRSM status meeting (06/22/2011), data conversion efforts are focused on the Data Initialization Plan. The data dictionary and conversion plan have been completed and Caltrans is still working on the implementation/test plan.
- May 11 Status:** In May 2011, the Data Task Force began a data conversion test using legacy data for District 4, which is the largest district. District 4 projects and expenditure data were loaded into a test environment at the end of May and a sizing/capacity estimate was completed. The result was that the test environment had the disk capacity to be used as a staging environment in preparation for the production PRSM implementation. In the March 2011 reporting period, an owner was identified to manage the Data Conversion effort and report on the status. In addition, the PRSM Project Team created a Data Task Force with the goal of identifying / compiling a list of data conversion issues and working to resolve the issues. The Data Task Force has been meeting during the month of March and is currently in the process of compiling the list of issues. One of IPOC's recommendations in the January 2011 IPOR was that the PRSM Project Team perform a root cause analysis for the data conversion delays. The PRSM Project team then requested that IV&V perform the root cause analysis. In February 2011, IV&V performed and submitted the root cause analysis. During the analysis IPOC and the PRSM Project Team provided comments and feedback. Within the analysis, IV&V identified the current state of conversion, current challenges, root causes, and recommendations. Some of the key points from this analysis are that the Data Initialization Plan (DIP) has not been finalized, the current status of the conversion effort as a whole is unknown outside of the Conversion Team, and there has been continuous Caltrans data issues identified by the Implementation Vendor. A number of other critical activities, including testing and training, are dependent on the data conversion effort. If the issues with the data are not resolved, it will cause additional delays in the schedule.

### **Issue I-2: PRSM Project Schedule**

**Issue Statement:** As part of the approval of the Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. During the PRSM Project Status Meetings, it has been noted that the delay Adaptation is due to the number of anomalies identified during configuration testing and issues regarding

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

---

data conversion. Although additional time has been built into the schedule, if activities at the task level are not appropriately managed, it could result in additional delays. In addition, there is a risk that the Implementation Vendor could submit another change request for increased costs. Please refer to the **Schedule** section on page 1 for additional information.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Joel Arpilleda

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- I-2a - IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team continue to evaluate the remaining testing and data conversion activities and build additional time into the PRSM Project Schedule as needed. Delays at the task and activity level should be recorded and tracked. In addition, delays that affect the critical path should be immediately discussed with members of the PRSM Project Management Team. If necessary, daily checkpoint meetings should be conducted to resolve issues that impact the critical path. Issues that cannot be resolved at the PRSM project team level should be escalated to the Executive Steering Committee immediately.
- I-2b -During the week of January 24<sup>th</sup>, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan (known as the go-forward plan) for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables by the end of February 2011. As of this IPOR, none of these deliverables have been finalized, however the project schedule has been partially updated to match the go-forward plan. IPOC recommends that Caltrans monitor the status of these deliverables and work with the Implementation Vendor to finalize them by the end of May 2011. Please refer to the **General Comments** section at the end of this IPOR for more information.
- I-2c - IPOC recommends that the progress of testing and data conversion should be reported in writing during the Status Meetings.

### **Status Update:**

June 11 Status: As of the last PRSM Project Status Meeting (dated 06/22/2011), the project schedule had been rebaselined to reflect the end of the Adaption phase milestone 10/24/2011.

May 11 Status: CAPA procurement has been added to the schedule. The procurement cycle for CAPA is 180 days; therefore the end date for Adaptation is now November 11, 2011. The trigger for starting the 180 day cycle is obtaining approval for the purchase of CAPA. Currently, the IT Project Manager is still waiting on the approval. A delay in the approval of the purchase may result in additional delays to the schedule. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. As of the PRSM Project schedule (dated 4/12/2011), many tasks do not have accurate finish dates and/or percentages complete. For these tasks, their current status and expected completion date is unclear. As of the last PRSM Project schedule (dated 05/25/2011), the project schedule has been partially rebaselined to reflect the Adaptation phase milestone of 10/17/2011. The PRSM Project schedule is estimated to be completely rebaselined by the end of May 2011 or beginning of June 2011. We will continue to monitor this area closely and report any updates as they occur.

### **Issue I-1: EFIS Interface (PCR 13)**

**Issue Statement:** The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and CTIPS are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. While developing to one standard interface presents a business opportunity, specifications and data requirements will need to be analyzed and documented. The development of the EFIS interface is a critical step for the PRSM project to proceed to the Pilot phase. EFIS went live in July 2010. The development of the EFIS interface could impact the cost of PRSM. There are two (2) potential scenarios related to this issue that could impact the schedule and / or cost: 1) the time compression in the transition of EFIS support from the EFIS Implementation Vendor to Caltrans could result in the EFIS Implementation Vendor fully focused on knowledge transfer and transition. The limited availability of EFIS resources could result in a delay in the development of the EFIS interface; and 2) with the focus on knowledge transfer and transition, PRSM is a lower priority for EFIS related support, which could result in resource constraints when it comes time to supporting the PRSM/EFIS interface/testing efforts.

Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

### **IPOC Recommendations:**

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

- I-2a PRSM interface acceptance criteria for entry to the Pilot phase should be agreed upon by the PRSM Project Team and Business Stakeholders. The criteria should include specifying the quality and completeness of the interfaces (degree of production readiness) before the Pilot phase.
- I-2b - Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

### Status Update:

June 11 Status: No new status.

May 11 Status: Interface testing is progressing and as of the Caltrans Unit Testing Status (dated 05/13/2011), has successfully completed all unit testing. As of the last PRSM status meeting (dated 05/25/2011), the completion of EFIS expenditures interface is pending changes to the Clarity (the PRSM Project Portfolio Management software) to utilize unit roles for project resources instead of named resources

### New Risks

There are no new risks.

### Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

#### Risk R-3: PRSM Project Costs

**Risk Statement:** With the previous delays in the PRSM project schedule and the remaining Adaptation activities (i.e., data conversion and testing) there is a possibility of another schedule delay. The possibility of another delay in the PRSM project schedule could have an impact on the cost of the project.

Probability: Medium      Impact: High      Time Frame: Short Term      Severity: High      Assigned to: Joel Arpilleda

#### **IPOC Recommendations:**

- R-3a – IPOC recommends that the current delay in Adaptation and the potential additional delays be discussed with the Executive Steering Committee. Upon review of the previous approved Implementation Vendor change request, if it is deemed likely that another change request for cost will be submitted, discussions with the Implementation Vendor should occur immediately.
- R-3b - IPOC recommends that potential Caltrans resource needs / cost impacts are assessed given the delay in Adaptation. These resource and potential cost impacts should be discussed with the executive steering committee.

### Status Update:

June 11 Status: As of the June 2011 reporting period, there has not been an increase in costs.

May 11 Status: As of the May 2011 reporting period, there has not been an increase in costs.

#### Risk R-2: Resource Availability

## Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

---

**Risk Statement:** Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium      Impact: Medium      Time Frame: Short      Severity: Medium      Assigned to: Joel Arpilleda

### IPOC Recommendations:

- R-2a - After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.
- R-2b - Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

### Status Update:

June 11 Status: No new status.

May 11 Status: In the March 2011 reporting period, a few of the PRSM Project Team roles were updated. The previous IT Lead became the Release Manager and Configuration Manager. A new team member was brought on to the project to fill in as the new IT Lead. During the February 2011 reporting period, a new Implementation Vendor Project Manager joined the PRSM Project Team. The previous Implementation Vendor Project Manager will stay on board to assist in the transition process. During the January 2011 reporting period, the Implementation Vendor has provided an Architect that is available to assist the testing team during half of their sessions and is on-call to answer questions. In addition, Caltrans has added two (2) additional resources to assist with the testing effort (one to assist with Configuration Testing and the other to assist with Integration Testing). Please refer to the **Resource** section on page 2 for additional information. As of the month of May, the Release Manager and Configuration Manager has transitioned back to the IT Lead

### **Risk R-1: Business Process Changes and Organizational Change Management**

**Risk Statement:** One of the most significant challenges to the PRSM Project could be engaging and obtaining buy-in from District executives, management and staff. It is very important that District executives and management are knowledgeable about PRSM and the changes to their business processes and benefits of using PRSM. District staff, in addition to training, should be knowledgeable of the decisions and consequences of changing / standardizing business processes. Lack of engagement of District personnel at all levels could have a negative impact on overall PRSM system acceptance and usage.

Probability: High      Impact: High      Time Frame: Med      Severity: High      Assigned to: David Youmans

### IPOC Recommendations:

- R-1a - Define the process for gaining District consensus on policies, new business rules and business processes. The process should describe how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.
- R-1b - Modify the format of the monthly Implementation Manager's Video Conference Meeting to begin utilizing this forum as a mechanism for Organizational Change Management. As PRSM gets closer to District roll out, change the frequency of these meetings to bi-weekly.
- R-1c - Assess the changes to the training program/plan proposed in the most recent implementation vendor change request in order to understand the impact on Organizational Change Management. Work with the Districts to help them understand the changes to the training program in order to gain organizational buy-in and confirm that the program is adequate to enable a successful Roll Out.
- R-1d - Assess the impact of the Implementation Vendor Change Request on Organizational Change Management.
- R-1e - Consider hiring / extending additional consulting resources to assist with refining the Organizational Change Management Plan and to execute the plan.

### Status Update:

June 11 Status: No new status.

**May 11 Status:** During the May reporting period, an outline of the PRSM Prep Course was presented during the Implementation Manager's meeting. On 5/26, a trial run of the course occurred with approximately 20 Caltrans Headquarters staff that were not involved with the PRSM project. Caltrans is currently aiming to deliver an expanded PRSM Prep Course during the month of July via video conference to Implementation Managers. During the April reporting period, IPOC met with the Organizational Change Management Team and discussed the plan for preparing for and implementing organizational change management at the districts. During this meeting, IPOC provided comments and recommendations to enhance the plan. In addition, IPOC was provided with the Draft Organizational Change Management Plan and provided comments.

### General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy. IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of May, including PRSM Status meetings, PRSM Risk and Issues meetings and PRSM Project Managers meeting.

On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. Throughout June 2010 and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the change request. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension (approximately 5 months) and cost increase. On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope (please note there is no change to schedule or cost). This change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. The goal for this is to keep activities in Adaptation that can be completed prior to November 23<sup>rd</sup> and move the remaining activities into early Pilot. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions. In addition, during the week of January 24th, Caltrans met with Executives from the Implementation Vendor to discuss a plan for moving forward with the project. One of the outcomes of the meeting was that the Implementation Vendor is going to finalize multiple deliverables that were previously in draft form. These deliverables include the Data Initialization Plan (DIP), Pilot Plan, and System Test Plan and were scheduled to be completed in February 2011. As of the June 22<sup>nd</sup> PRSM Project Status Meeting, only the System Test Plan was agreed upon and finalized. The DIP and the Pilot Plan were still in progress and have not been completed. The updated due date for each outstanding deliverable is as follows: the Pilot Plan is now under review and discussion by the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans and does not currently have a completion date. The Data Initialization Plan (DIP) has been divided into three (3) components: Data Dictionary, Conversion, and Implementation/Test. The Data Dictionary and Conversion plans have been completed. The Implementation/Test component of the DIP has been started, however it does not currently have a completion date. For more information on the data conversion issues, please refer to **Issue I-3: Data Conversions**.

As part of the approval of the August 2010 approved Implementation Vendor change request, the Executive Steering Committee and the Implementation Vendor agreed that the Adaptation Phase would not go past November 23, 2010. According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011 and the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. Please refer to the **Schedule** Section on Page 1 for additional information.

In the July 2010 reporting period, the PRSM project was re-organized so that the Project Management function is now under IT and a new Project Manager has been assigned to PRSM. This new Project Manager will be responsible for the day to day, hands-on project management activities for PRSM. The Project Management function was previously under the Division of Project Management. With the re-organization, the previous Project Manager is now providing oversight as the Project Director.

A number of project processes have been modified since the change in Project Management structure in July 2010. The PRSM Project Schedule, which was previously managed by the Implementation Vendor, is now managed by Caltrans. The new Project Manager has added baseline start and finish columns to the schedule to track baseline completion dates against actual completion dates. During the bi-weekly PRSM Project Status Meetings, the new Project Manager has allocated time in the agenda for each of the PRSM Project Team Workgroups (such as Configuration, Interfaces, Conversion, etc.) to conduct brief status updates of their current tasks, risks, and issues. Beginning in May 2011, the structure of the PRSM Project Status meetings will change. Going forward, attendees of the status meetings will only include PRSM Project Managers and Oversight vendors. The purpose of these meetings will be to provide a status update of each area of the project, without going into the task level detail of the work plan. In addition to these meetings, another weekly meeting will be scheduled for each area (i.e., testing, training). During these meetings, team members will update the schedule based on their assigned activities and provide updates to their team lead.

In addition to the bi-weekly PRSM Status meetings and the bi-weekly PRSM Risk and Issues meetings, PRSM Change Management meetings occur on a weekly basis if there are open changes to discuss. During these meetings new and open project change requests (PCR's) are discussed by PRSM Project Management and the Implementation Vendor



Project Manager. As of the 06/22/2011 PRSM Project PCR Log, there were no recently opened PCRs, three PCRS in progress (15: Update Training Plan; 20: Update to Configuration Management Plan, and 21: Updated To Be Business Processes from version 2.3 to 2.4), and three recently closed PCRs (13: Change from FiDO/EVRS to E-FIS Interface, 14: Cost for EFIS Interface, and 16: Go Forward Plan).

In August 2010, the Caltrans Enterprise Technology Investment Division requested that IPOC perform a health check assessment on the PRSM project. The objective of the health check assessment was to provide a point in time assessment of the PRSM project and identify findings, risks and recommendations associated with Project Management and Systems Development Lifecycle (SDLC) areas. IPOC activities performed for the Health Check assessment included interviewing key project team members and reviewing project documentation. On October 7, 2010, IPOC submitted the finalized Health Check report to Caltrans.

# CALTRANS - PRSM Project Oversight Review Checklist (June 2011)

## Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is October 2011 (per the last approved project schedule).

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
<p><b>Planning and Tracking</b></p> <p>Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?</p> <p>Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software?</p> <p>Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?</p>	X	X	<p>An updated SPR was approved by the OCIO on December 8, 2009. The OCIO has requested that Caltrans submit a new SPR for the schedule delay.</p> <p>The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point.</p> <p>The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task.</p> <p>On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with an extension to the schedule and a cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved the schedule extension and cost increase.</p> <p>On October 6, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted another change request for a change in scope. The change request included changing the scope of the remaining Adaptation Phase activities and moving some of the remaining activities into Pilot. After several back and forth counterproposals, the Implementation Vendor rejected the latest Caltrans counterproposal. Caltrans updated the schedule to indicate the new task dates as they related to the original contract provisions.</p> <p>According to the most recent schedule (dated June 22, 2011), the end date for Adaptation is October 24, 2011. Adaptation Phase activities (i.e., testing and data conversion) are scheduled to be completed by October 24, 2011. In addition, the end date for the PRSM Project is December 21, 2012. This represents a delay of approximately 1 year and four months for Adaptation and approximately 10 months for the PRSM Project. It was noted in the PRSM Project Status meeting on May 25,</p>

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
				2011 that this PRSM Project schedule is the rebaselined schedule and has been updated to reflect new tasks and task durations. Caltrans is currently working on a new SPR for the schedule change, and once the SPR has been approved, the status of this item will be reflected as Adequate.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?		X		On a bi-weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and completion of planned tasks is updated as necessary.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system. An overall project WBS list of approximately 2,000 items exists in MS Excel.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X		On a bi-weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X		Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team and the Implementation Vendor.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?		X		A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009. On June 9, 2010, the Implementation Vendor submitted a change request with a cost increase of \$947,422. Throughout June and July 2010, Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor were in negotiations regarding the potential cost increase. In the August 4th, 2010 Executive Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Steering Committee approved a cost increase of \$864,977 (\$464,977 from removing Years 2-3 Custom Code Maintenance and \$400,000 from "Unanticipated Cost").
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?		N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?		N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?		N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?		X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?		X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?		X		During status meetings, the PRSM Project Manager distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?			X	The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products. Finalization of configuration requirements occurred in the September 2010 reporting period.

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate		Deficient		Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?		X				There is an open issue on the PRSM Issue Log (Issue # 253) stating that although the Configuration Management Plan identifies a process for promotion of code and other configuration items, the process does not appear to be followed. The latest status of this issue states that the Implementation Vendor has updated the Plan and Caltrans has reviewed the plan and provided comments to the Project Manager. Per the PRSM Issue Log (dated June 22, 2011), the next step is for Caltrans and SAIC to set up a meeting to discuss changes to the original comments.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?		X				An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis. As of May 18, 2011 the PRSM project team has begun utilizing a centralized repository to track and manage all potential and open issues.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?		X				Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. In addition, Caltrans scheduled Implementation Team training sessions that provided the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. Training Session #1 occurred during the week of September 14, 2009. After completion of Session #1 training, the PRSM Project Team gathered feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and used the feedback to update and/or improve Training Session #2, which occurred during the week of September 28, 2009. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project. During Pilot and Roll Out, each district will have the opportunity to complete a user satisfaction survey.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?		X				Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?		N/A		N/A		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment. Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
<b>Procurement</b>						
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?		X				The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?		X				Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?		X				Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?		X				Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?		N/A		N/A		The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate		Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Risk Management					
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?		X			The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted May 2011. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager. Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis.  As of May 18, 2011 the PRSM project team has begun utilizing a centralized repository to track and manage all potential and open risks.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?		X			Risk and Issue Management meetings are held on a bi-weekly basis.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?		X			A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy.
Communication					
Is there a written project communications plan?		X			The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?		X			The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?		X			Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?		X			Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering					
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?		X			Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?		X			Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. In addition, the Implementation Vendor has been delivering a series of Checkpoints, which include a review of the PRSM configurations and design documentation. After each checkpoint, the PRSM Project Team gathers and consolidates their feedback on what was presented and provides it to the Implementation Vendor. The Implementation Vendor originally stated that there would be four (4) checkpoints

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			over the course of the Adaptation Phase. In the March 2010 reporting period, the implementation Vendor stated that the remainder of the configurations would be presented in Checkpoint 4 or any of number of checkpoints needed. Checkpoint 4 was performed in April 2010. The walkthrough included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans is incorporating review cycles through the new checkpoint implementation approach.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	X		The PRSM Project Team has performed formal configuration reviews to occur during checkpoints throughout the Adaptation Phase. In the March 2010 reporting period, the implementation Vendor stated that the remainder of the configurations would be presented in Checkpoint 4 or any of number of checkpoints needed. Checkpoint 4 was performed in April 2010. The walkthrough included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. In addition, IV&V is currently performing code reviews and is planning to work with Caltrans IT to finalize code review process.
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase

# Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products		Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X			Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X			PCR's 8 (modifications to technical requirements related to Work Package 1) and 9 (deletion of technical requirements or parts of technical requirements, which are obsolete, redundant, or no longer needed) were approved in the June 2010 reporting period. PCR 12 (remainder of requirements not covered in PCR's 8 or 9) was approved in the August 2010 reporting period. Per the new baseline schedule (dated August 31, 2010), the Requirements Baseline effort was completed on August 24, 2010. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X			The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.